Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 ISSN 2563-3392

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Table of Contents

Inaugural Issue

Alonquin Anishnaabeg Land Acknowledgement
Lynn Gehl **1**

Introduction
Marie-Françoise Guédon
English **3**
Français **8**

Blind: The Western gaze at matricultures, historically Part 1
Linnéa Rowlatt **15**

Introduction to Peggy Reeves Sanday's "The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape"
Pauline McKenzie-Aucoin **29**

The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape, A Cross-Cultural Study (reprint)
Peggy Reeves Sanday **31**

From Matrilineal Kinship to Matriculture: Establishing a Canadian Agenda (workshop report)
Linnéa Rowlatt **47**

Matriculturality and the Alonquian Language Family: An Interim Report, May 2020 (research report)
Marie-Françoise Guédon **89**

Annonce: *Les sociétés matriarcales: Recherche sur les cultures autochtones à travers le monde*
Heide Goettner-Abendroth **118**

About *Matrix*

Matrix: A Journal for Matricultural Studies (*Matrix*) is an open-access, peer-reviewed and refereed scholarly journal published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture. This is an Open Access journal licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

Culture (Network on Culture), Canada. *Matrix* is published online twice yearly (Autumn/Winter and Spring/Summer).

Matrix is a new journal in the humanities and social sciences, founded to provide an interdisciplinary forum for those who are working from the theoretical stance of matriculture as a Geertzian cultural system. Similar to other cultural systems such as art, religion, or mathematics, employing the heuristic of matriculture allows for, among other things: cross-cultural comparisons; fresh insights into the social roles of women, men, otherwise identified, children, and the entire community of humans, animals, and the environment; and/or renewed understandings of historically mislabelled cultures. With Guédon's work in mind, then, and based on Geertzian principles, the concept of matriculture is both a model *of* reality by rendering the structure of matricultures apprehensible and a model *for* reality, where psychological relationships are organized under its guidance.

We encourage submissions from scholars around the world who are ready to take a new look at the ways in which people - historically and currently - have organized meaningful relationships amongst themselves and with the natural environment, the myths, customs, and laws which support these relationships, and the ways in which researchers have documented and perhaps mis-labeled the matricultures they have encountered.

EDITORIAL COLLECTIVE

Marie-Françoise Guédon, PhD
Angela Sumegi, PhD
Linnéa Rowlatt, PhD - Managing Editor
Idoia Arana-Beobide, MA
Christine Mathieu, PhD
Judith Ramos, MAT
Kierra Beament, MA
Margaret Kress, PhD

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY CIRCLE

Peggy Reeves Sanday, PhD
Heide Göttner-Abendroth, PhD
Kaarina Kailo, PhD
Marc Fonda, PhD

To join our private mailing list and receive notification of new issues, send a request to the email address below here.

Contact: info@networkonculture.ca (subject line: Matrix Editorial Collective)

Volume 01, Issue 01 May 2020 Pg. 1-2

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Algonquin Anishinaabeg Land Acknowledgement

LYNN GEHL, PhD, Algonquin Anishinaabe-kwe

Ottawa was built on Algonquin Anishinaabeg traditional territory. The Algonquin Nation was one of the first Indigenous Nations that Champlain recorded as he travelled up the Kichesippi, best translated as the Great River, now called the Ottawa River.

Algonquin territory consists of approximately 48 million acres inclusive of rivers, lakes, boreal forests, rock, trees, four legged, winged, and finned. Through the creation of Upper and Lower Canada, now Ontario and Quebec, and through the French surrender of land that they did not own to the British, the Algonquin Anishinaabeg have been divided along the very river that once united them. Through the overlay of Canada, the nation state, and the imposition of a provincial federal order, the Algonquin are now divided by language, law, and religion. While approximately 39 million acres of traditional territory is in Quebec, 9 million is in Ontario.

Through processes of genocide inherent in colonization, which continues today, the Algonquin have been relegated to small plots of land. There are ten federally recognized First Nation communities made up of mostly registered status members: one in Ontario and nine in Quebec. These communities reside on only small fractions of the larger Algonquin Anishinaabeg traditional territory. Pikwàkanagàn First Nation's land base consists of a mere 1,561 acres; Barriere Lake only 59; while Wolf Lake has been denied a land base altogether. There are also many communities in Ontario, made up of mostly non-status members, that have been more formally organized to accommodate the federal government's need to define Indigenous rights in narrow terms, and they all lack their own collective land base known as reserve lands.

The Kichesippi has been subjected to the logging, hydroelectric, nuclear power, and the fishing and sport hunting industries. These industries have clogged the Great River, flooded important landscapes, and are currently dumping radio-active particles in the river. Moreover, the nuclear power industry is warming up the river through using the water to cool down nuclear reactors.

Although the Algonquin Anishinaabeg were emissaries during the 1764 Treaty at Niagara, and many of the men fought on the side of the British during the 1776 American revolution, and during WW1 and WW2, Algonquin were and are continually denied the jurisdiction of their land and resources.

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture. This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

Anishinaabe knowledge philosophy is a life way that situates humans within a broader context of the natural world versus a religion selectively practiced. Within this philosophy, the Four Sacred Elements – Water, Rock, Wind, and Fire – are valued as more intelligent than other beings. As such, places where they intersect are sacred. This way of knowing and being is best understood as emerging from the naturalistic paradigm versus the humanistic paradigm. Within this philosophy it is valued that women exist closer to Creator because they open the Eastern Doorway during child birth, and in terms of the nurturing and caring work that they do. Whereas men, in the work they do such as taking life and trees for sustenance, exist further away from Creator. In this way, it is said that Algonquin women hold more of Creator's knowledge.

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 3-7

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Introduction

(*english*)

MARIE-FRANÇOISE GUÉDON, PhD

When, in the mid twentieth century, women became an important, then essential, topic in social and human sciences, the research was habitually focused on the question: What is the role – or status - or function - of women in this or that society or culture? From Margaret Mead onwards, a good ethnographic monograph had to contain at least one chapter on women's lives and contributions to the community. Later, if only to satisfy feminist critics, it became mandatory for most social sciences projects to mention the voice of women, so contributing to the slow emergence of women's lives from an essentially male world, and women's perspectives from an essentially male gaze. The initial question focusing on the status of women in a community, society or culture, however, implies that women are part of a larger essentially masculine whole on which they depend for their existence, or from which they derive their identity and definition (even when this ensuing development is not intended by the researcher). What is implied becomes more obvious when we reverse the question and ask instead: "In this culture or society, what is the role - or status, or function - of men?"

In most cultures composing the contemporary world, such a question is not part of the habitual way of thinking. Yet some cultures do function in this mode and present themselves as societies where the men's world is explicitly derived from the women's world. And not a few cultures, most of which are Indigenous and matrilineal, are comfortable with the above question but understand it as leading to the attribution of valued responsibilities and active roles to every gender in a world where all genders are actively involved in the making and sustaining of the cultural and social milieu, either because gender differentiation is not considered important or is limited to people's adulthood, or because complementarities rather than hierarchies inform the dominant values.

Following the lead of Nicole-Claude Mathieu in the study of matrilineal societies, a network of researchers gathered after her death to carry her project forward. Over the past fifteen years, we combed the anthropological, historical, and, more generally, social sciences literature, contacted matrilineal societies, questioned established notions, and formulated research agendas. With researchers coming from all continents, from various disciplines and professional paths, and from matrilineal communities themselves, we now compose a network, dispersed as it is, in need of

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture. This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

formal means of shared communication and of a stable concrete base for guests and passers-by. Hence this new journal.

Our engagement, as summarized by my questioning the usual approach about the status of women, places us in a marginal position (See Penny Harvey, AYEC: 5-8 for a discussion of the advantages of marginality) and we aim less at convincing the public at large, or even our colleagues, than at developing a framework which will allow us to speak about societies where it makes sense to ask: In this community, what is the status of men? And we have to affirm the existence of such societies.

Anthropology is the place where the questions we are asking and the terms we are using were first formulated. Our anthropological roots offer space for other disciplines and approaches. We also find ourselves sharing this space with thinkers coming from many different socio-cultural backgrounds.

Looking at the history of the social sciences, Postmodernism, then Deconstructionism and Post-Deconstructionism, Post-Colonialism, and of course, Feminism, to name only a few of the great intellectual currents of our times, have swept through Anthropology and brought irreversible changes to our perspectives and procedures. Women's Studies emerged, then underwent profound upheavals. Anthropologists questioned the existence of their discipline, reframed its central components, such as the notion of culture, and re-organized kinship studies in the light of new gender research in a critical process toward more reflexivity.

Yet the present conclusions of our research group lead to the admission that for all these intellectual and ideological interrogations and *mouvance*, we are not yet equipped for the task of describing and engaging with societies and cultures where both mothers and fathers have full access to the fabric of their community's life. In a strange twist of mind, while our disciplines have rejected, for the most part, theories of the mid-nineteenth century concerning women, we have not re-examined our terminology and still use terms and concepts inherited from scholars like Edward Burnett Tylor, Lewis Henry Morgan or Johann Jakob Bachofen to describe matrilineal societies (*See Linnéa Rowlatt's exploration of the historical antecedents of matrilineal studies, this issue*). While we are able to disentangle gender from sex and from the plurality inherent to both, we still find it difficult to examine matrilineal systems, or, worse, their cultural contexts, without pre-suppositions inherited from a century and an half ago. We easily speak about patriarchy, but we shy away from contemporary Indigenous societies whose people have borrowed from our past academic debates terms such as matriarchy or matricentricity to describe themselves.

The assumptions hidden in our basic terms of reference (what Rik Pinxten (1989) would call root principles) are ingrained in our languages and our thinking as researchers, if not in our lives, and are not easily questioned. They go without saying. Yet when we manage to examine or deconstruct them, or when we appose them to the wordviews of others, particularly those with whom we are conducting research, we may be brought to rewrite past ethnographies or to read them in a different light. Annette Weiner's ethnographic work among the Tropbriand Islanders and Peggy Reeves Sanday's long-term ethnography with the Minangkabau in Sumatra are strong examples of what can then be achieved.

In our initial projects, we first attempted a kind of census, a simple list of matrilineal societies in the world. For the record, we started with about one hundred of them. We soon realized that the data presently available is not adequate to the task. Information about the presence of matrilines was sometimes suppressed, often misunderstood, or simply not recorded. As a default label for the kinship system, the term bilateral was often preferred (*See Guédon's interim report on matrilineage in Algonquian-speaking societies, this issue*). As Nicole-Claude Mathieu suggested, matrilineality takes many forms and one observes, for instance, a number of societies with *de facto* local lineages deriving from matrilocality rules (the new couple moving to the wife's parents' home, or to the wife's mother, or each partner remaining at home in their respective mother's home). These are not recorded as lineage societies since they do not fit the traditional criteria for matrilineality. We met the debates of matriarchy and matriarchal theories, including those of the Germany-based scholars, together with modern Indigenous communities exploring the use of these terms to define themselves, and we wondered whether a great deal of confusion could be avoided by first (a) considering matrilineality as having to do with kinship, and matriarchy as having to do with governance (following Peggy Reeves Sanday's proposition), then (b) paying attention to the ways in which matriarchy is defined by the communities who use the term to describe themselves - regularly not as a mirror image of patriarchy but as an entirely different, less hierarchical system in which women play a central role while upholding the importance and value of all members of the society, including men. As noted by Christine Mathieu, this distinction between kinship and governance should also apply to patrilineal lineage systems and patriarchy, the latter being a 'system where men are responsible for governance'.

Other projects unveiled the role played by the cultural context associated with matrilineal systems. Forty years ago, for my PhD research, I visited northern North American Indigenous Athapaskan-speaking hunter-gatherer communities in order to explain how a semi-nomadic society could develop matrilineal clans. According to then-prevalent theories, such a system was to be found primarily among agriculturalists, such as the Iroquoian-speaking tribes in eastern North America, or else must have been borrowed from sedentary neighbors, such as the Northwest Coast maritime-based societies. I had to conclude, with Frederica de Laguna, that the Athapaskan hunters do not borrow their matrilineal exogamous clans and moiety systems from their neighbours. New visits to Alaska have since confirmed the flexibility and adaptive value of social arrangements that are owned by both men and women, and of related cultural traits. That is, that women are hunters; they are mobile, traveling on their own, babies and all, and, among the several traits contributing to the 'status' of women in that society, gender is more of an individual choice. These traits are not necessarily the result of a matrilineal system, but they appear to be part of a cultural set which supports a matri-clanic organization. Later, I worked with the Tsimshian-speaking Gitksan people of northern British Columbia, also a people with exogamous matrilineal lineages (*Wilp*, or Houses), clans, and phratries. Then, I visited the matrilineal Mosuo people in Yunnan and Sichuan. All my observations pointed to a pervasive link between the social system and the rest of the cultural context. Either matrilineality can penetrate large segments of culture, or matrilineality itself is only part of a larger cultural system which encompasses key aspects of culture in both its male and female expressions. Encounters with colleagues and with representatives of Indigenous communities have confirmed the urgency of a debate on matrilineal cultures.

To explore the potential links between the cultural context, and, more specifically, the worldview of matrilineal societies and their kinship or clan systems, we organized a series of workshops and conferences which brought together interested parties from both the academic world and Indigenous communities. People from the Americas, Europe, Africa, Asia and Australia joined us in two meetings; the first was hosted by the Southwestern University of Nationalities in Chengdu, Sichuan, China, and the second took place at the University of Ottawa, Canada. The international dimension is necessary because there are much fewer researchers interested in what used to be a mainstay of anthropology and ethnology than there are matrilineal cultures in the world today. These encounters resulted in the creation of the Global Matrilineal Research Network (MatNet), presented at the 2018 meeting of the Canadian Anthropological Society / Société canadienne d'anthropologie held in Cuba. Through these meetings, we strengthened three main methodological orientations:

a) A precise ethnographic or ethnohistorical, linguistic, and comparative approach as our first reference;

b) A shift from matrilineality as a kinship and social system to a cultural system – in Geertz' classical sense of the term – which emphasizes the cultural context in which such traits as matrilineality can arise, including the worldview and values or ethos of that context. For this, we introduced the term 'matriculture' to replace the narrower term 'matrilineal' as a focus of our research framework (*see Rowlatt's workshop report, this issue*); and

c) A careful deconstruction and deep critique of the terms used by all concerned (whether ethnographers, politicians, Indigenous people, or academics) to describe and define, directly or indirectly, the cultural systems with which we are working (*see, for instance, the study by Bernard Saladin d'Anglure on the notions of duality and opposition as expressed in the Inuit traditions*).

Recognition of the role played by the culture *as a whole* in sustaining matricultural systems is liberating in more ways than one. In her list of potentially fertile developments to be considered, Nicole-Claude Mathieu had listed links between matrilineality and certain shamanic traditions, mythologies, birthing practices, gender definitions, or even cultural continuity. Most importantly, this recognition is explicit in what the Indigenous communities themselves are telling us: the principles outlining and supporting their clans and lineages or noble houses are also those by which they live and think about the world

What then is matriculture? A society could not survive without recognizing, at the very least, motherhood and womanhood, together with fatherhood and manhood, and without acknowledging the part played by women in constructing the world in which it exists. We use the expression 'matricultural system' to designate that part or those components of culture that sustain, express, and welcome women's participation in the socio-cultural fabric, whether it sustains a matrilineal kinship system or not. A matricultural system may be minimal and derivative, or it may be considered the essential source of its cultural context, with all variations in between

these two extremes. Whenever we meet a culture where the matricultural system is strong, where womanhood plays a central part, or where the world is at least a common enterprise for all genders, we describe it as a matriculture.

Methodologically speaking, looking at culture as if it were a male construct does not necessarily correspond to the reality in the field; it is simply a habit of thought. If we are not born members of a matriculture, this habit is a consequence of our own cultural roots. It prevents us from accessing and accounting for the lives of the many societies that are rooted in different assumptions. With matriculture in mind, we begin to question received ideas. For instance, we will not take for granted the universality of the notion of domesticity, even less of female domesticity opposed to a male public space; we will not assume the universality of the twin notions of Man the Hunter and woman the gatherer (or women staying at home). We will not assume that chiefs and leaders are everywhere male, with women stepping in only by default, or that power is everywhere defined in the same way. We will not assume that menstruations are everywhere marked as impure or enfeebling. We will not assume that nuclear families are more moral than extended families. These are a few examples of the many assumptions challenged over the course of our inquiries. Upon encountering them, we can, at the very least, inquire about the possibility of diverging propositions.

We have first to admit that societies with strong matricultures exist, that they are sustainable, and that they have existed as long as patrilineal or patriarchal societies. Then, as scholars, we must develop concepts which fit their realities; this will allow us to understand the terms of their engagement with the world. But first we have to listen to them. While many of these societies are either gone or endangered, they still continue to exist in sufficient number to be noticeable not as exceptions but, rather, as alternatives. Furthermore, they are not isolates or discrete entities closed upon themselves; they are not even cut off from the global world to which we are accustomed. Although these societies are all under threat, especially in their essential linguistic heritages, their members are engaged in global business and politics as modern humans. Finally, any preliminary research would demonstrate their immense diversity, even at the level of kinship organization and lineage definition. The generalizing definitions of matrilineal organizations which have been our tools until now are not adequate to the task.

There is a pedestrian quality to our research program and to this new journal. Precise ethnography, a reflexive approach, and the recognition of worldviews are basic ingredients of ethnology. Setting the records straight, or at least straighter, in an obscure corner of social sciences is hardly the stuff of revolution. Yet that corner is a window opened on different ways of thinking, and the locus for a great celebration welcoming cultural diversity in all its brilliance (in Redfield's term) and the enduring presence of Indigenous societies. You, our readers and partners, are invited to the feast.

Marie-Françoise Guédon
Ottawa, Canada
May 2020

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 8 - 13

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Introduction

(*française*)

MARIE-FRANÇOISE GUÉDON, PhD

Lorsque, au milieu du XXe siècle, les femmes sont devenues un sujet important, puis essentiel, en sciences sociales et humaines, la recherche s'est habituellement concentrée sur la question: quel est le rôle - ou le statut - ou la fonction - des femmes dans tel ou tel société ou culture? À partir de Margaret Mead, une bonne monographie ethnographique devait contenir au moins un chapitre sur la vie des femmes et leurs contributions à la communauté. Plus tard, ne serait-ce que pour satisfaire les critiques féministes, il est devenu obligatoire pour la plupart des projets de sciences sociales de mentionner la voix des femmes, contribuant ainsi à la lente émergence de la presence des femmes dans un monde essentiellement masculin et des perspectives féminines à côté d'un regard essentiellement masculin. La question initiale centrée sur le statut des femmes dans une communauté, une société ou une culture implique cependant que les femmes font partie d'un ensemble plus large essentiellement masculin dont elles dépendent pour leur existence ou dont elles tirent leur identité et leur définition (même lorsque ceci n'est pas voulu par le chercheur). Ce qui est insinué devient plus évident lorsque nous inversons la question et demandons plutôt: "Dans cette culture ou société, quel est le rôle - ou le statut, ou la fonction - des hommes?"

Dans la plupart des cultures composant le monde contemporain, une telle question ne fait pas partie du mode de pensée habituel. Pourtant, certaines cultures fonctionnent dans ce mode et se présentent comme des sociétés où le monde des hommes est explicitement dérivé du monde des femmes. Et plusieurs cultures, dont la plupart sont autochtones et matrilinéaires, sont à l'aise avec la question ci-dessus mais la comprennent comme conduisant à l'attribution à chaque genre de responsabilités et de rôles valorisés dans un monde où tous les genres sont activement impliqués dans la fabrication et le maintien du milieu culturel et social, soit parce que la différenciation entre les genres n'est pas considérée comme importante ou se limite à l'âge adulte, soit parce que les complémentarités plutôt que les hiérarchies informent les valeurs dominantes.

Suivant l'exemple de Nicole-Claude Mathieu dans l'étude des sociétés matrilinéaires, un réseau de chercheurs s'est réuni après sa mort pour faire avancer son projet. Au cours des quinze dernières années, nous avons passé au peigne fin la littérature anthropologique, historique et, plus généralement, la littérature des sciences sociales, contacté des sociétés matrilinéaires, remis en question des notions établies et formulé des programmes de recherche. Avec des chercheurs

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture.
This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

venus de tous les continents, de disciplines et de parcours professionnels variés, et des communautés matrilinéaires elles-mêmes, nous composons maintenant un réseau dispersé, qui a besoin de moyens formels de communication et d'une base concrète pour les invités et les visiteurs. D'où ce nouveau journal.

Notre engagement, comme le résume ma remise en question de l'approche habituelle concernant la condition de la femme, nous place dans une position marginale (voir Penny Harvey, AYEC: 5-8 pour une discussion sur les avantages de la marginalité) et nous visons moins à convaincre le public dans son ensemble, ou même nos collègues, qu'à développer un cadre qui nous permette de parler de sociétés où il est logique de se demander: dans cette communauté, quel est le statut des hommes? Et nous devons affirmer l'existence de telles sociétés.

L'anthropologie est le domaine où les questions que nous posons et les termes que nous utilisons ont d'abord été formulés. Nos racines anthropologiques offrent un espace pour d'autres disciplines et approches. Nous nous retrouvons également à partager cet espace avec des penseurs issus de milieux socio-culturels différents.

En regardant l'histoire des sciences sociales, le post-modernisme, puis le déconstructionnisme et le post-déconstructionnisme, le post-colonialisme et, bien sûr, le féminisme, pour ne nommer que quelques-uns des grands courants intellectuels de notre temps, ont balayé l'anthropologie et apporté des changements irréversibles à nos perspectives et procédures. Les études des femmes a émergé, puis a subi de profonds bouleversements. Les anthropologues ont remis en question l'existence de leur discipline, recadré ses composantes, telles que le concept de culture, et réorganisé les études de parenté à la lumière de nouvelles recherches sur le genre dans un processus critique vers plus de réflexivité.

Pourtant, les présentes conclusions de notre groupe de recherche conduisent à admettre que malgré ces interrogations intellectuelles et idéologiques et cette mouvance, nous ne sommes pas encore équipés pour la tâche de décrire et d'engager des sociétés et des cultures où les mères et les pères ont accès au tissu de la vie de leur communauté. Dans une étrange tournure d'esprit, même si nos disciplines ont rejeté, pour la plupart, les théories du milieu du XIXe siècle concernant les femmes, nous n'avons pas réexaminé notre terminologie et utilisons toujours des termes et des concepts hérités de penseurs comme Edward Burnett Tylor, Lewis Henry Morgan, ou Johann Jakob Bachofen pour décrire les sociétés matrilinéaires (*voir l'exploration de Linnéa Rowlatt des antécédents historiques des études matrilinéaires, ce numéro*). Bien que nous soyons en mesure de dissocier le genre du sexe et de la pluralité inhérente aux deux, nous trouvons toujours difficile d'examiner les systèmes matrilinéaires, ou pire, leurs contextes culturels, sans présupposés hérités d'un siècle et demi auparavant. Nous parlons facilement du patriarcat, mais nous nous détournons des sociétés autochtones contemporaines dont les membres ont emprunté à nos débats universitaires passés des termes tels que matriarcat ou matricentricité pour se décrire.

Les présuppositions cachées dans nos termes de référence (ce que Rik Pinxten (1989) appellerait des principes fondamentaux) sont ancrées dans la langue et dans notre façon de penser en tant que chercheurs, sinon dans nos vies, et ne sont pas facilement remises en question. Elles vont sans dire. Pourtant, lorsque nous parvenons à les examiner ou à les déconstruire, ou lorsque nous les confrontons aux visions du monde des autres, en particulier de ceux avec lesquels nous menons des recherches, nous pouvons être amenés à réécrire des anciennes ethnographies ou à les lire

sous un autre jour. Le travail ethnographique d'Annette Weiner parmi les Trobriand Islanders et l'ethnographie à long terme de Peggy Reeves Sanday avec les Minangkabau à Sumatra sont de bons exemples de ce qui peut alors être réalisé.

Dans nos premiers projets, nous avons d'abord tenté une sorte de recensement: une simple liste des sociétés matrilinéaires dans le monde. Pour mémoire, nous avons commencé avec une centaine d'entre eux. Nous nous sommes vite rendu compte que les données actuellement disponibles n'étaient pas adaptées à la tâche. Les informations sur la présence de matrilignées étaient parfois supprimées, souvent mal comprises ou simplement non enregistrées. En tant qu'étiquette par défaut pour le système de parenté, le terme «bilatéral» était souvent préféré (*voir les travaux de Guédon sur la lignée maternelle et le pouvoir politique des femmes dans les sociétés algonquiennes pour un exemple nord-américain*, *ce numéro*). Comme l'a suggéré Nicole-Claude Mathieu, la matrilinéarité prend plusieurs formes, et l'on observe, par exemple, un certain nombre de sociétés avec des lignées locales *de facto* dérivées des règles de la matrilocalité (le nouveau couple déménageant au domicile des parents de l'épouse, ou chez la mère de l'épouse, ou chaque partenaire restant dans la maison de leur mère respective). Celles-ci ne sont pas enregistrées en tant que sociétés de lignage car elles ne correspondent pas aux critères traditionnels de matrilinéarité. Nous avons rencontré des débats sur le matriarcat et les théories matriarcales, y compris celles des universitaires basés en Allemagne, ainsi que des communautés autochtones modernes explorant l'utilisation de ces termes pour se définir, et nous nous sommes demandé si beaucoup de confusion pourrait être évitée, d'abord (a) en considérant la matrilinéarité comme ayant à voir avec la parenté et le matriarcat comme ayant à voir avec la gouvernance (suivant la proposition de Peggy Reeves Sanday), et ensuite (b) en prêtant attention aux façons dont le matriarcat est défini par les communautés qui utilisent le terme pour se décrire - régulièrement non pas comme une image miroir du patriarcat mais comme un système entièrement différent et moins hiérarchique dans lequel les femmes jouent un rôle central tout en préservant l'importance et la valeur de tous les membres de la société, y compris les hommes. Comme l'a fait remarquer Christine Mathieu, cette distinction entre parenté et gouvernance devrait également s'appliquer aux systèmes de lignée patrilinéaires et au patriarcat, ce dernier étant un «système où les hommes sont responsables de la gouvernance».

D'autres projets ont dévoilé le rôle joué par le contexte culturel associé aux systèmes matrilinéaires. Il y a quarante ans, pour ma recherche de doctorat, j'ai visité des communautés de chasseurs-cueilleurs autochtones de langue athapascane d'Amérique du Nord afin d'expliquer comment une société semi-nomade pouvait développer des clans matrilinéaires. Selon les théories alors en vigueur, un tel système se trouvait principalement chez les agriculteurs, tels que les tribus de langue iroquoienne dans l'est de l'Amérique du Nord, ou bien il devait être emprunté à des voisins sédentaires, tels que les sociétés maritimes de la côte nord-ouest. J'ai dû conclure, avec Frederica de Laguna, que les chasseurs Athapascans n'empruntent pas leurs clans exogames matrilinéaires et leurs systèmes de moitiés à leurs voisins. De nouvelles visites en Alaska ont depuis confirmé la flexibilité et la valeur adaptative des arrangements sociaux qui appartiennent à la fois aux hommes et aux femmes, et des traits culturels connexes. C'est-à-dire que les femmes sont des chasseuses; elles sont mobiles, voyageant seules, bébés et tout, et, parmi les nombreux traits qui contribuent au «statut» des femmes dans cette société, le genre est davantage un choix individuel. Ces traits ne sont pas nécessairement le résultat d'un système matrilinéaire, mais ils semblent faire partie d'un ensemble culturel qui soutient également une organisation matri-clanique. Plus tard, j'ai travaillé avec les Gitksans de langue Tsimshian du nord de la Colombie-Britannique, également

avec des lignées matrilinéaires exogames (les *Wilp*, ou Maisons), des clans et des phratries. Ensuite, j'ai rendu visite au peuple matrilinéaire Mosuo dans le Yunnan et le Sichuan. Toutes mes observations ont indiqué l'existence d'un lien omniprésent entre le système social et le reste du contexte culturel. Soit la matrilinéarité peut pénétrer de larges segments de la culture, soit la matrilinéarité elle-même n'est qu'une partie d'un système culturel plus vaste qui englobe des aspects clés de la culture dans ses expressions masculine et féminine. Des rencontres avec des collègues et des représentants des communautés autochtones ont confirmé l'urgence d'un débat sur les cultures matrilinéaires.

Pour explorer les liens potentiels entre, d'une part, le contexte culturel et, plus spécifiquement, la vision du monde des sociétés matrilinéaires et, d'autre part, leurs systèmes de parenté ou de clan, nous avons organisé une série d'ateliers et de conférences qui ont réuni des parties intéressées du monde universitaire et des communautés autochtones. Des gens des Amériques, d'Europe, d'Afrique, d'Asie et d'Australie se sont joints à nous lors de deux réunions; le premier a été organisé par l'Université du sud-ouest des nationalités à Chengdu, Sichuan, Chine, et le second a eu lieu à l'Université d'Ottawa, Canada. La dimension internationale est nécessaire car il y a beaucoup moins de chercheurs qui s'intéressent à ce qui était autrefois un pilier de l'anthropologie et de l'ethnologie qu'il n'y a de cultures matrilinéaires dans le monde aujourd'hui. Ces rencontres ont abouti à la création du Réseau mondial de recherche sur les matricultures (MatNet), présenté lors de la réunion de 2018 de la Canadian Anthropological Society / la Société canadienne d'anthropologie tenue à Cuba. Par le biais de ces rencontres, nous avons renforcé trois grandes orientations méthodologiques:

a) Une approche ethnographique ou ethnohistorique, linguistique, et comparative précise comme première référence;

b) Un passage de la matrilinéarité en tant que système social et de parenté à un système culturel - au sens classique du terme pour Geertz - qui met l'accent sur le contexte culturel dans lequel des traits tels que la matrilinéarité peuvent apparaître, y compris la vision du monde et les valeurs ou l'éthos de ce contexte. Pour cela, nous avons introduit le terme «matriculture» (*voir Rowlatt et Guédon, ce numéro*) pour remplacer le terme plus étroit «matrilinéaire» comme axe de notre cadre de recherche; et

c) Une déconstruction minutieuse et une critique approfondie des termes utilisés par tous les intéressés (ethnographes, peuples autochtones, politiciens ou universitaires) pour décrire et définir, directement ou indirectement, les systèmes culturels avec lesquels nous travaillons. *(Voir, par exemple, l'étude de Bernard Saladin d'Anglure sur les notions de dualité et d'opposition telles qu'elles s'expriment dans les traditions inuit.)*

La reconnaissance du rôle joué par la culture *dans son ensemble* dans le maintien des systèmes matriculturels est libératrice à plus d'un titre. Dans sa liste d'évolutions potentiellement fertiles à considérer, Nicole-Claude Mathieu a répertorié les liens entre la matrilinéarité et certaines traditions chamaniques, mythologies, pratiques d'accouchement, définitions de genre, voire la continuité culturelle. Ce qui importe le plus, c'est que cette reconnaissance est explicite dans ce que les communautés autochtones elles-mêmes nous disent: les principes qui définissent et soutiennent leurs clans et leurs lignées ou maisons nobles sont également ceux par lesquels elles vivent et pensent le monde.

Qu'est-ce donc que la matriculture? Une société ne pourrait survivre sans reconnaître, à tout le moins, la maternité et la féminité ainsi que la paternité et la masculinité, et sans reconnaître le rôle joué par les femmes dans la construction du monde dans lequel cette société existe. Nous employons l'expression «système matriculturel» pour désigner la ou les composantes d'une culture qui soutiennent, expriment et accueillent la participation des femmes au tissu socioculturel, que cette culture soutienne ou non un système de parenté matrilinéaire. Un système matriculturel peut être minimal et dérivé ou il peut être considéré comme la source essentielle de son contexte culturel, avec toutes les variations entre ces deux extrêmes. Chaque fois que nous rencontrons une culture où le système matriculturel est fort, où la féminité joue un rôle central, ou dans laquelle le monde est au moins une entreprise commune à tous les genres, nous le décrivons comme une matriculture.

Sur le plan méthodologique, regarder la culture comme s'il s'agissait d'une construction masculine ne correspond pas nécessairement à la réalité du terrain; c'est simplement une habitude de pensée. Si nous ne sommes pas nés membres d'une matriculture, cette habitude est une conséquence de nos propres racines culturelles. Il nous empêche d'accéder et d'expliquer la vie de nombreuses sociétés qui sont ancrées dans des présuppositions différentes. Avec la matriculture à l'esprit, nous commençons à remettre en question les idées reçues. Par exemple, nous ne tiendrons pas pour acquise l'universalité de la notion de domesticité, encore moins d'une domesticité féminine opposée à un espace public masculin; nous n'assumerons pas l'universalité des notions jumelles d'homme chasseur et de femme cueilleuse (ou de femmes restant à la maison). Nous ne supposerons pas que les chefs et les dirigeants sont partout des hommes, les femmes n'intervenant que par défaut, ou que le pouvoir est partout défini de la même manière. Nous ne supposerons pas que les menstruations sont partout marquées comme impures ou affaiblissantes. Nous ne supposerons pas que les familles nucléaires sont plus morales que les familles élargies. Ce ne sont là que quelques exemples des nombreuses hypothèses contestées au cours de nos enquêtes. En les rencontrant, nous pouvons à tout le moins nous interroger sur la possibilité de propositions divergentes.

Nous devons d'abord admettre qu'il existe des sociétés avec des matricultures fortes, qu'elles sont durables et qu'elles existent depuis aussi longtemps que les sociétés patrilinéaires ou patriarcales. Ensuite, nous devons développer des concepts qui correspondent à leurs réalités; cela nous permettra de comprendre les termes de leur engagement avec le monde. Mais nous devons d'abord les écouter. Bien que bon nombre de ces sociétés soient disparues ou en voie de disparition, elles continuent d'exister en nombre suffisant pour ne pas être perçues comme des exceptions mais plutôt comme des alternatives. De plus, ce ne sont pas des isolats ou des entités discrètes refermées sur eux-mêmes; elles ne sont même pas coupées du monde global auquel nous sommes habitués. Bien que ces sociétés soient toutes menacées, en particulier dans leurs héritages linguistiques essentiels, leurs membres sont engagés dans les affaires et la politique mondiales en tant qu'êtres humains modernes. Enfin, toute recherche préliminaire démontrerait leur immense diversité, même au niveau de l'organisation de la parenté et de la définition de la lignée. Les définitions généralisantes des organisations matrilinéaires qui ont été jusqu'à présent nos outils ne sont pas adaptées à la tâche.

Il y a une qualité prosaique dans notre programme de recherche et dans ce nouveau journal. Une ethnographie précise, une approche réflexive et la reconnaissance des visions du monde sont des

ingrédients de base de l'ethnologie. Remettre les pendules à l'heure, ou du moins plus à l'heure, dans un coin obscur des sciences sociales n'est guère une affaire de révolution. Pourtant, ce coin est une fenêtre ouverte sur différentes façons de penser, et le lieu d’une grande célébration accueillant la diversité culturelle dans toute sa splendeur (comme le dit Redfield) et la présence durable des sociétés autochtones. Vous, nos lecteurs et partenaires, êtes invités à la fête.

Marie-Francise Guédon
Ottawa, Canada
May 2020

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 15 - 28

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Blind: the Western gaze at matricultures, historically Part I

LINNÉA ROWLATT, PhD

Abstract

Matricultures are glaringly absent from the historical archive. Societies where women play a central role do have a presence in Western historical accounts – but mostly through words written by men who are not members of the culture and who generally fail to understand the cultural system in question (for example, the Jesuit account of the matricultural Mohawk). This results in many analyses and descriptions which do not provide a reliable emic account of the matricultural community in question. Why is this? The hypothesis of this article is that, due to the overpowering historical influence exerted by a corrupted Classical concept of the Amazon as man-killer, Western writers were unable to accurately perceive cultures where women held and continue to hold central social and cosmogenic positions (ie: matrilineal, matrifocal, matrilocal, or matriarchal societies).

This article surveys the historical record for Western views of matricultures and introduces a summary of the evolution in outsiders' thought about these societies ranging from the Classical era to the 21st Century. The heuristic is Marie-Françoise Guèdon's concept of matriculture (see Introduction, this Issue), specifically the following: matriculture is culture approached as a whole, taking the female world as primary and as a cultural system in the Geertzian sense of the term.

*****

Les matricultures sont manifestement absentes des archives historiques. Les sociétés où les femmes jouent un rôle central sont présentes dans les récits historiques occidentaux - mais principalement par le biais des mots écrits par des hommes qui ne sont pas membres de la culture et qui ne comprennent généralement pas le système culturel en question (par exemple, le récit jésuite de la matriculture mohawk). Il en résulte de nombreuses analyses et descriptions qui ne fournissent pas un compte émique fiable de la communauté matriculturelle en question. Pourquoi est-ce? L'hypothèse de cet article est qu'en raison de l'influence historique écrasante exercée par un concept classique

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture.
This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

corrompu de l'Amazone en tant que tueur d'hommes, les écrivains occidentaux n'ont pas été en mesure de percevoir avec précision les cultures où les femmes occupaient et continuent d'occuper des positions sociales et cosmogéniques centrales (c.-à-d. : sociétés matrilinéaires, matrifocales, matrilocales ou matriarcales).

Cet article examine l'historique des perspectives occidentales concernant les matricultures et présente un résumé de l'évolution de la pensée des étrangers sur ces sociétés allant de l'ère classique au 21e siècle. L'heuristique est le concept de la matriculture de Marie-Françoise Guèdon (voir l'introduction du présent numéro), spécifiquement le suivant: la matriculture est la culture abordée dans son ensemble, prenant le monde féminin comme primaire et comme système culturel au sens geertzien du terme.

Introduction

This article explores the European gaze upon matricultural cultural systems from Antiquity to the present, discussing perceptions of matricultures by Western observers, the accuracy of their descriptions, and, briefly, consequences of any misperceptions. I will also question the gaze itself, speculating upon the reason global matricultural cultural systems have been largely invisible until today. My thesis is that the encounter of Classical Greeks with certain tribes among Scythian society before the Common Era provided the raw material for a Western cultural stereotype of a specific style of feminine equality to men – martial equality - which eclipsed historical matricultural cultural systems when they were encountered later and in other places. In effect, I will demonstrate that the concept of the one-breasted, man-hating Amazon blinded Westerners to the reality of prospering Indigenous matricultural cultural systems encountered during the following centuries, and some consequences of that. The topic is large, covering centuries of historical documents and several areas of encounter between matricultures and Westerners, including European exploration, European colonization, Western anthropology, and Western feminism. Given the length constraints of journal articles, this article is the first part of three; parts II and III will be published in future issues of *Matrix*.

As our understanding of matriculture as a cultural system deepens and widens, its absence from the Western historical record deserves some attention. Patriarchal customs and *moeurs* may have diminished Western matricultures to near-silence, but during the expansionist and colonial centuries, men from England, Spain, Holland, France, Germany, Portugal, Italy, and other European countries came into contact with flourishing matricultures all over the world. That contact inspired a well-known behavour: explorers would provide their country of origin (whether in person or in writing) with sufficient information to provide the foundations of national or imperial policy and practice. Was there a promise of material resources which were intrinsically valuable to Europeans, as in the case of Aztec gold, or which could be transformed into items of value, such as the pelt of *Castor Canadensis*? Details about the challenges in extracting it were provided. What about the humans who occupied the lands wherein these resources were located and their culture? This was also provided, because hostile natives were liable to impede a cost-effective harvesting of the resource in question. European explorers and colonizers, therefore, made a point of describing previously unknown societies and cultures in order to provide understanding and knowledge for

decision-makers in Europe and, also, to feed public curiosity about strange people in strange lands.[1]

Differences in other types of cultural systems, such as religion or art, were recognized as stemming from different 'conceptions of a general order of existence'.[2] They were identified and sometimes described in detail, such as forays made into the Chinese mathematical system during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[3] Little attention, however, was given to varying conceptions of sex and gender relations. Since at least fifteen percent of world societies today are matrilineal[4] - at least eighty-four different societies[5] - and matrilineality is a strong indicator for matriculture, a method of exploring the record for historical views of societies with a strong matriculture is simply to search the archive for initial comments about societies which are matrilineal today or are known to have been matrilineal at time of contact.

My analysis relies upon Marie-Françoise Guédon's theory of gynocentric gender relations, referred to as the matricultural cultural system, or matriculture for short. It was initially articulated as follows at the 2018 annual meeting of the Canadian Anthropological Society (CASCA):

> For many years, anthropology has explored the expression and role of women in culture and not noticed matriculture, which is a cultural system that supports the expression of women. Matriculture is culture approached as a whole, taking women's voices and statements seriously, not fitting or superimiposing women within a world defined by male authority but rather taking the female world as primary. Using Geertz' definition of cultural systems as a methodology, particular matricultural systems can therefore be compared to other matricultures. Some cultures have a weakly defined matricultural system; other cultures have strong matricultural systems with all kinds of ramificiations that may include matrilineal kinship, matrilocality, matriarchal features, with serious consequences on the socio-cultural status of women and children, as well as men.

As mentioned, Guédon's theory is founded upon Clifford Geertz' classical definition of a cultural system, whose importance in the context of matricultures lies in serving, for an individual or for a group, as a source of general, yet distinctive conceptions of women, of men, of sexes and gender, and of relations among them in the world, on the one hand – its model *of* aspect – and of rooted, no less distinctive social, economic, or political dispositions – its model *for* aspect – on the other.[6]

---

1 For examples, see the collection and analysis of Raleigh's reports about Virginia to Queen Elizabeth I in Michael G. Moran, *Inventing Virginia: Sir Walter Raleigh and the Rhetoric of Colonization* (New York: Peter Lang, Inc, 2007) or the first collected publication of Cortes' letters about Mexico to King Charles V in Hernán Cortés, *Cartas y relaciones de Hernan Cortés al emperador Carlos V*, edited by Pascual de Gayangos (Paris: A. Chaix, 1866).

2 Clifford Geertz, Religion as a Cultural Symbol' in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Basic Books, 1973), 90.

3 See, for example, Edouard Biot, 'Note sur la connaissance que les Chinois on eue de la valeur de position des chiffres', Nouvelles et Mélanges, *Journal Asiatique* (Leuven: Soiété Asiatique / Peeters, Décembre 1839), 497-502, or Alexander Wylie, 'Jottings on the Science of the Chinese', first published in the *North China Herald* (Aug.-Nov. 1852, Nos. 108-111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 119, 120, and 121) and reprinted in A. Wylie, *Chinese Researches* (Taipci: Ch'eng-wen, 1966), 159-84.

4 See the electronic Human Relations Area Files (https://ehrafworldcultures.yale.edu/ehrafe/).

5 Aberle, David F., 'Matrilineal Descent in Cross-cultural perspective', in *Matrilineal Kinship*, eds. David M. Schneider and Kathleen Gough (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961), p. 655.

6 Based on Geertz' famous definition in 'Religion as a Cultural System' in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 123.

In this context, matrilineal kinship systems and matriarchal, matrilocal, or matrifocal societies are social expressions of a matricultural cultural system. Based on the theory of matriculture as a cultural system, one could equally argue that there is an as-yet-unnamed cultural system of which patriarchy is a social expression,[7] or even perhaps other cultural systems for sex and gender relations – central to human society as ways of conceptualizing sex and gender relationships in the context of human reproductive biology.

Further, Geertz notes that the effects of cultural systems 'spread beyond their specifically metaphysical contexts[8] to provide a framework of general ideas in terms of which a wide range of experience – intellectual, emotional, moral – can be given meaningful form' and that such beliefs do not merely interpret social and psychological processes, but also shape them.[9] Given their centrality to questions of identity and concurrent social roles, cultural systems for sex and gender relations are fundamental to human communities past and present. As recently discussed by Laura Clark, "Together, kinship and clans were the inward and outward anatomy, figuratively the flesh and matrilineal bones that moved many details of Mvskoke Creek life and formed a tribal worldview."[10]

Still referring to religious cultural systems, Geertz also wrote that in one society, the level of elaboration of symbolic formulations of ultimate actuality may reach extraordinary degrees of complexity and systemic articulation; in another, no less developed socially, such formulations may remain primitive in the true sense, hardly more than congeries of fragmentary by-beliefs and isolated images, of sacred reflexes and spiritual pictographs.[11] In her definition of matriculture, Guédon speaks directly to this point by saying that some cultures may display developed matricultures, while others do not. Her comment points to the systemic nature of cultural systems; some cultures have developed cultural systems in arts but not maths, while others have developed cultural systems of maths but undeveloped cultural systems of arts. While every society on earth includes women, some have developed matricultures and others not, which is to say that in some societies, the level of elaboration of women's expressions and access to experience may reach extraordinary levels of complexity and systemic articulation – and other societies, not so much. Those societies with developed matricultures foster and support the experiences and expressions of women and will, therefore, have a historical archive that records these experiences and examples of these expressions. For societies without developed matricultures, the experiences and expressions of women in the historical archive is largely absent.

Finally, when discussing art as a cultural system, Geertz noticed that "The feeling an individual, or what is more critical, because no man is an island but a part of the main, the feeling a people has for life appears, of course, in a great many other places than in their art. It appears in their religion, their morality, their science, their commerce, their technology, their politics, their amusements, their law, even in the way they organize their everyday practical existence."[12] Cultural systems all.

7 I speculate that such a cultural system might be called 'patriculture', or 'androculture', but that is an exploration for another article.

8 In this context, Geertz is discussing religion as a cultural system; in the context of this article, 'metaphysical contexts' could comfortably be replaced with 'sex and gender relations'.

9 Geertz, p. 123.

10 Clark, Laura Marshall, '"The World At Our Door": Scottish and Irish settlers among Muscogee (Creeks) and other southeastern tribes, 1700-1830" (unpublished masters thesis, University of Oklahoma, Department of Native American Studies, 2019), p. 37.

11 Ibid., p. 124

12 Geertz, Clifford, 'Art as a Cultural System', *MLN*, Vol. 91, No. 6, Comparative Literature (Dec., 1976), (1473-1499) p. 1475.

Geertz went on to analyze common sense and ideology as cultural systems,[13] and others have taken advantage of the concept to analyze such widely disparate subjects as advertising,[14] design,[15] and memory.[16]

Other scholars have further developed the Geertz' insight; authors of a recent introduction to cultural systems declares that "culture is not defined by a single process or system, but is the conjunction of many aspects of human cognition and organization. These would include processes or systems relating to communication, learning, adaptation, representation and transformation."[17] And, finally, the same authors state "All modern anthropologists (and most post-modern anthropologists) dispute any conception that culture can be represented in terms of static structures; culture is dynamically enacted, constituted differently by different culture-enacting agents, but with results that are comprehensible, if not acceptable, to other agents."[18] Guédon's research into sex and gender relations as a cultural system worthy of analysis and her conclusions regarding the nature of matricultural cultural systems make a noteworthy addition to the field.

This article is structured chronologically, and begins with a brief exposition of current research on Amazons, a concept now known to have been based on nomadic and semi-nomadic people who lived during the early Classical period, followed by a summary of Classical Greek descriptions of them and the corruption of those descriptions into an inaccurate stereotype. The bulk of the article consists of exploring European encounters with Indigenous matricultures around the world (explorers, missionaries, anthropologists, even feminists) and the frequency with which they were mis-labeled as Amazons, misunderstood culturally, and/or dismissed as irrelevant – also for centuries.

Amazones antianeirai

In her outstanding 2014 monograph *The Amazons: Lives and Legends of Warrior Women Across the Ancient World*, Stanford Classicist Adrienne Mayor assembles persuasive linguistic, documentary, and material evidence confirming the historical reality of Amazons – but not as those of us living in the twenty-first century would recognize them. Rather, Mayor shows how the basis for today's notion of the Amazon originates in an 'extensive cultural zone consisting of a great many loosely connected nomadic and seminomadic ethnic and language groups that ranged over the great swath of territory extending from Thrace, the Black Sea, and northern Anatolia across the Caucasus Mountains to the Caspian Sea and eastward to Central and Inner Asia'.'[19] Currently referred to as the Thracian and Scythian peoples, Greeks encountered these loosely confederated

13 See Geertz, Clifford, 'Common Sense as a Cultural System', *The Antioch Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Spring 1975), pp. 5-26, Geertz, Clifford, 'Ideology as a Cultural System', in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 193-233, and

14 Sherry, John F., Jr., 'Advertising as a Cultural System', in New Directions in the Study of Signs for Sale (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1987)), pp. 441-62.

15 Murphy, Keith M., 'Design as a Cultural System', *EPIC: Advancing the Value of Ethnography in Industry* (Perspectives), 17 May 2016 (https://www.epicpeople.org/design-as-a-cultural-system/), accessed 9 May 2019.

16 Schwartz, Barry, 'Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln in World War II', *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 16, No. 5 (Oct., 1996), pp. 908-27.

17 Fischer, Michael D., Dwight Read, and Stephen M. Lyon, 'Introduction: Cultural Systems', *Cybernetics and Systems: An International Journal*, 36 (2005), p. 721

18 Ibid., p. 722.

19 Adrienne Mayor, *The Amazons: Lives & Legends of Warrior Women Across the Ancient World* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 35. See also Eileen Murphy, *Iron Age Archaeology and Trauma from Aymyrlyg, South Siberia*, BAR International Series 1152, pp. 3-4, and Table 1, p. 4.

tribes when they established trading colonies along the Black Sea, beginning in about 700 BCE.[20] They were, in effect, neighbouring societies and, until the nomadic Scythians disappeared from the archaeological record in about 300 CE, contemporaries.[21] It is plausible that the Amazons described in Homeric times were a specific tribe among the Scythian peoples, one whose gender relations stood out to Greek observers, but, as evidence shows, not remarkable for Scythians.

Since the advent of osteoarcheaological or paleo-osteological methods of analysis, particularly DNA analysis, research with Scythian graves shows that roughly twenty-five percent of warrior burials were women and, in the region directly north of the Black Sea, up to thirty-seven percent.[22] The tombs of these women include a full range of items necessary for fighting and hunting and their bones bear battle scars similar to those of male warriors; until these advanced methods of analysis were available, the graves had been assumed to contain men.[23] Having assembled this data, Mayor turned to documentary evidence for more information about the women, primarily Greek but also Persian, Egyptian, Arabian, Chinese and Central Asian.

There are an abundance of references to Amazons in Greek sources from Antiquity, many of whom could have personal experience or second-hand experience of Amazons or Scythians. The earliest recorded mention is in Homer's *Iliad* (8th C. BCE), where they are named as *Amazones antianeirai*.[24] As the first reference, the term deserves some attention. The first word takes the form of an ethnic designation commonly found in epic poetry, similar to *Trooes* for the Trojans and *Hellenes* for the Greeks themselves. This indicates that *Amazones* was, originally, a Hellenized noun for a people, a group, a tribe. However, it does not have the distinctively feminine ending for nouns one would expect if the tribe was composed entirely of women; that ending is *-ai*, such as *Trooiai* for Trojan women.

The second word – *antianeirai* - is a descriptor following the noun, similar to *Saka Tigraxauda* ('the Saka, Pointed Hat Wearers') or *Budini Phtheirotragein* ('the Budini, Eaters of Lice'). It was common for the Greeks to identify foreigners by referring to their exotic or disturbing customs, such as lice-eating, pointed-hat-wearing, or cannibalism. Although *antianeirai* is often translated in modern times as 'opponents of men', this translation fails to recognize the drift of meaning accrued to the prefix over centuries. In ancient Greek epic diction, the prefix *anti-* meant 'equivalent' or 'matching' – *not* 'opposing' or 'against'. Moreover, the descriptor is a uniquely feminine plural ethnonym compounded to include the Greek masculine noun *aner* ('man'). Greek names for tribal people were typically masculine, with the understanding that female members were included in the collective name. With the feminine ending, however, the Greeks were calling attention to the extraordinary status (to them) of women among the *Amazones*. The ethnonym is likely to have originally meant something like 'Amazons, the tribe whose women are equal to men' or, 'Amazons, the equals'.[25]

---

20 Müller, Christel, 'Nomades scythes et états grecs du nord de la Mer Noire (VIIe-IIe s. a.C.)', in *Le monde de l'itinérance en méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne : Procédures de contrôle et d'identification, Tables rondes*, eds. Maurice Sartre, Claudia Moatti, Wolfgang Kaiser, and Christophe Pébarthe (Pessac: Ausonius Éditions, 2009), pp.93-112.

21 Ivantchik, Askold, 'Scythians', *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, 2018, available at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/scythians; accessed 15 May 2019.

22 Ibid., p. 82; see also Bryan Hanks, 'Reconsidering Warfare, Status, and Gender in the Eurasian Steppe Iron Age', in *Are All Warriors Male? Gender Roles on the Eurasian Steppe*, eds. Katheryn Linduff and Karen Rubinson (Lanham MD : Altamira Press, 2008), pp. 15-34.

23 Mayor, pp. 63-5.

24 Homer, *Iliad*, 3.189; 6.186; for an example of *Trooiai*, see Homer, *Iliad*, 3.384.

As a result, within the oral-tradition based *Iliad*, Greeks have identified the *Amazones* ethnographically as a people with both men and women, distinguished by something outstanding (to the patriarchal Greeks) in their gender relations. There are many more Greek descriptions of elements of Amazon and Scythian life, such as the trousers worn by both sexes among the tribes, as reported by Herodotus (ca. 484 – 425 BCE) and others,[26] the tattoos of Amazon / Scythian / Thracian women,[27] horsemanship,[28] light weaponry suitable for use from horseback, especially the recurve composite bow,[29] and, of course, the martial skills of Amazon / Scythian / Thracian women.[30] Documentary material from other literate societies bordering the nomads record similar features, but since this article focuses on Western scholarship, they will not be discussed further here.

Each detail mentioned above finds material confirmation through archaeological research. Both wide and narrow trousers fashioned from leather, wool, hemp, flax and silk have been found preserved from decomposition for over 2300 years in Scythian burials towards the dryer and colder eastern limits of their territory, such as that of a mass grave at the western end the Tarim Basin where female and male warriors were interred together.[31] There are unfortunately few textile remains from Black Sea-area tombs. Tattoos on both women and men have been found on mummified human remains from the same eastern areas,[32] including those on the stunning 1993 'Ice Maiden' discovery by Natalia Polosmak,[33] while equipment for tattooing has been discovered

25 Mayor, pp. 22-4 and Ch. 5. This view of the name is supported by Richard Burton, *A Mission to Gelele King of Dahome*, ed. C.W. Newbury (London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), p. 254, n.1. For further linguistic discussion of the name Amazon, see also Josine Blok, *The Early Amazons : Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth* (Leiden : Brill, 1995); M.E. Huld, 'Some Thoughts on Amazons', *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 30:93 (2002), pp. 93-102; John Colarosso, *Nart Sagas from the Caucasus Myths and Legends from the Circassians, Abazas, Abkhaz, and Ubykhs* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002); and Adrienne Mayor, John Colarosso, and David Saunders, 'Making Sense of Nonsense Inscriptions Associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian Vases', *The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 83:3 (July-September 2014), pp. 447-93.

26 Herodotus, Bk. IV, 111, Bk. VII, 61-93; Hippocrates, *Airs Waters Places*, 22; many Antique vase paintings depict trousered Amazons, such as the white-ground alabastron held by the Princeton University Art Museum, Carl Otto von Keinbusch Jr. Memorial Collection Fund. It is thought to have been made by the Syriskos Painter, ca. 480-470 BCE. (https://artmuseum.princeton.edu/collections/objects/32602, accessed 16 May 2019)

27 Clearchus of Soli, *Lives*, ca. 320 BCE; the original account of his travels through Thrace and Skythia is lost and preserved only in fragments. His comment about tattooing is relayed in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 12.27 (524 d, e).

28 Lysias, *Funeral Oration* 4 (395 BCE). Horses were first domesticated on the grasslands of Ukraine, southwest Russia, and west Kazakhstan around 4000 BCE – Scythian territory during Antiquity.

29 Lysias, *Funeral Oration* 2 (395 BCE); Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4.4.16. (ca. 370 BCE).

30 Arctinos, *Aethiopis* (775 BCE?), now lost. The epic tells of the arrival of Penthesilia and her Amazons to Troy after the burial of Hector, the battle between Achilles and Penthesilia, and Penthesilia's death. The story is retold in Quintus of Smyrna, *Fall of Troy (The Trojan Epic: Posthomerica* (375 CE?), trans. and ed. A James (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004); Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 68-70 (b. 436– d. 338 BCE);

31 Mayor, pp. 204-7; Robert A. Jones, 'Centaurs on the Silk Road: Recent Discoveries of Hellenistic Textiles in Western ChinaI, *The Silk Road* 6/2, pp. 25 and 28; Lyn Webster Wilde, *On the Trail of the Women Warriors: the Amazons in myth and history* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 1999), p. 65; Margareta Gleba, 'You Are What You Wear: Scythian Costume as Identity', in *Dressing the Past*, edited by Margarita Gleba, Cherine Munkholt, and Marie-Louise Nosch, Ancient Textiles series V. 3 (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2008), p. 26; Elena E. Fialko and Yuri V. Boltryk, 'Textiles from Scythian burial complexes', *Tyragetia* (Serie Nouă), (2013), pp. 335-44.

32 Barkova, L.L., and Pankova, S.V., 'Tattooed Mummies from the Large Pazyryk Mounds: New Findings', *Archaeology, Ethnology & Anthropology of Eurasia*, 2 (22), 2005, pp. 48-59, and Natalya Polosmak, 'A Mummy Unearthed from the Pastures of Heaven', *National Geographic* 186:4 (1994), 80-103.

33 Polosmak, Natalia, 'A Different Archaeology. Pazyryk culture: a snapshot, Ukok, 2015', in *Science First Hand*, Dec 2015, N3(42), p. 95; also available online at https://scfh.ru/en/papers/a-different-archaeology-pazyryk-culture-a-snapshot-ukok-2015-/ (accessed 3 October 2019).

in graves of both sexes everywhere on the steppes - directly implying a widespread practice.[34] The intimate relationship between Scythian people and horses is evidenced by numerous human graves of both sexes who are accompanied by equine sacrifices, along with thousands of pieces of tack (harnesses, bridles, bits, frontlets, false antlers and masks, light saddles, saddle blankets, and more).[35] Both male and female Scythian skeletons show typical signs of extensive time on horseback.[36]

With respect to weaponry, the graves of warriors who are confirmed to be women through DNA analysis have the same types and quantity of weapons as the graves of male warriors. Typical weapons found with grave goods include those common to horse warriors: battle-axe, light spear, crescent shield, sword, the composite recurve bow and a quiver of arrows.[37] It should be noted that riding a horse removes the advantage of men's greater upper body strength in violent conflict. Also common is skeletal evidence that Scythian women engaged in and died by violence as often as men.[38] Typical of pastoral societies, Mayors speculates that youths of both sexes learned to ride by age five and, when grown, were capable of defending themselves, herds, property, and tribal territory. The ratio of female to male graves and the age of their occupants suggest that young women could choose to remain hunters and warriors when they were adults, paralleling statements of Herodotus and Hippocrates that it was customary for young women to prove themselves in battle and that older women fought by choice or whenever necessary.[39]

Centering around DNA analysis, the evidence suggests that horses rendered irrelevant physical differences between women and men as warriors, that communities where sex appears to have been less important as an indicator of social status were situated directly on the edges of northern Greek society, and that the *Amazones Antianeirai* were likely one tribe of people among Scythian society. These people would not recognize themselves in the modern notion of the Amazon, with

---

34 Yablonsky, Leonid T., 'Extraordinary Kurgan Burial Shines New Light on Sarmatian Life', *Ancient Historical Research Foundation* (17 September 2013), http://www.ancienthistoricalresearchfoundation.com/index.php/item/31-extraordinary-kurgan-burial-shines-new-light-on-sarmatian-life, accessed 16 May 2019; Adrienne Mayor, 'People Illustrated', *Archaeology* 52: 2 (1999), 54-7.

35 Baumer, Christoph, *The History of Central Asia: The Age of the Steppe Warriors* (London: Tauris, 2012); Emilian Teleaga, 'Die Prunkgräber aus Agighiol und Vraca', in *Amazonen: Geheimnisvolle Kriegerinnen*, Exhibition Catalogue, Historischen Museums der Pfalz, Speyer (Munich: Edition Minerva, 2010), pp. 78-85; Iaroslav Lebedynsky, *Les Amazones, mythe et réalité des femmes guerrières chez les anciens nomades de la steppe* (Paris: Errance, 2009), pp. 40-42; Renate Rolle, 'Frauen und Pferde', in *Amazonen: Geheimnisvolle Kriegerinnen*, Exhibition Catalogue, Historischen Museums der Pfalz, Speyer (Munich: Edition Minerva, 2010), pp. 160-3; Mayor, 'Bones: Archaeology of Amazons', in *The Amazons: lives and legends of warrior women across the ancient world* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014), pp. 63-83; Alan K. Outram *et al*, 'The Earliest Horse Harnessing and Milking', *Science* 323 (March 2009), https://science.sciencemag.org/content/323/5919/1332, accessed 17 May 2019.

36 Murphy, Eileen M., "Herodotus and the Amazons Meet the Cyclops: Philology, Osteoarchaeology, and the Eurasian Iron Age', in *Archaeology and Ancient History: breaking down the boundaries* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 169-84.

37 Mayor, p. 209. For a full discussion of the range and volume of weaponry found in women's graves, see Mayor, pp. 63-82 and 209-33. See also Elena F. Fialko, 'Zhenskiye pogrebenya s orushiem v skyphskih kurganah stepnoi Skyphii (The female burials with weapons among the Scythians: Kurgans of the Scythian steppes)', *Editorial Naukova Dumka* (1991), pp. 4-18, and Zaur Hasanov, 'The Cult of Female Warriors and Rulers in the Scythian and Sarmatian Cultures', *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica 1* (2018), pp. 131-50.

38 See above note, as well as Mayor, p.156; Renate Rolle, *The World of the Scythians* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), p. 88; Mike Adamson, *An Archaeological Analysis of Gender Roles in Ancient Non-Literate Cultures of Eurasia* (unpublished masters thesis, Department of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide, July 2004).

39 Mayor, p. 83.

her single breast, hatred and regular murder of men, and propensity towards male infanticide. What happened?

The Amazon

The single-breasted, man-hating Amazon galloped into the archive at an early date. First mentions of Amazonian cauterization of the right breast appeared in a now-lost history of Hellanikos (ca.450 – ca. 380 BCE), written some three hundred years after Homer. Hellanikos played a common etymological game of interpreting foreign words through Greek sounds, declaring that, since *-mazon* was similar to *maston* (the Greek word for breast) and the prefix *a-* means 'not' or 'without', this must mean that every Amazon lacked a breast.[40] Hippocrates, writing around 400 BCE, supported Hellanikos' game in his work *On Airs, Waters, Places* when discussing the Sauromatae, a neighbouring Scythian tribe, with the following:

> Their women mount on horseback, use the bow, and throw the javelin from their horses, and fight with their enemies as long as they are virgins; and they do not lay aside their virginity until they kill three of their enemies, nor have any connection with men until they perform the sacrifices according to law. Whoever takes to herself a husband, gives up riding on horseback unless the necessity of a general expedition obliges her. They have no right breast; for while still of a tender age their mothers heat strongly a copper instrument constructed for this very purpose, and apply it to the right breast, which is burnt up, and its development being arrested, all the strength and fullness are determined to the right shoulder and arm.[41]

There are strong reasons to doubt the breast-cauterizing statements of Hellanikos, Hippocrates, and others, beside its possibility of originating in a word game: first, Herodotus did not once refer to what would have been a horribly painful practice in all his careful descriptions of Scythian tribespeople. Secondly, some thousand or more visual depictions of Amazons on Greek vases, statues, and coins all have both breasts; there is not a single one with a breast removed.[42] If Amazon, Scythian, or Thracian women regularly removed a breast, surely it's not too much to ask that a single image portray it? Finally, and most tellingly, the graves of Scythian women where mummification occurred due to a dry or frozen environment have corpses with both breasts intact. It remains impossible to prove a negative; of course, regularly cauterizing the right breast of girl-children *could* have happened, but more convincing material or cultural evidence must be

40 Writing slightly later than Herodotus, there are only fragments surviving of Hellanikos' works, but his introduction of a chronological framework to chronologies and, hence, an historical narrative has proven influential and enduring. Phillip Harding, trans. and ed., *The Story of Athens: the fragments of the local chronicles of Attika* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 3-13. Other examples of such word play include a competing theory that the name meant 'without grain' because *maza* was Greek for barley, Aphrodite's name due to her having been born from the sea foam (*aphros*), (Hesiod, *Theogony*) or her son being called *Aeneas* because she had terrible grief (*ainos*) due of him (*Homeric Hymn* 5.198-9). Mary R. Lefkowitz, *Women in Greek Myth*, 2nd Ed.(Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007). See also David Braund, 'Myth and Ritual at Sinope: From Diogenes the Cynic to Sanape the Amazon', *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 16 (2010), p. 18, and Robert L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography: Volume 2: Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 687 and n19.

41 Hippocrates, *On Airs, Waters, and Places*, trans. Francis Adams, ca. 400 BCE, part 17; http://classics.mit.edu/Hippocrates/airwatpl.17.17.html, accessed 19 May 2019.

42 Pomeroy, Sarah B., *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Schocken, 1975), p. 24; Mayor, pp. 89-90.

provided to support an acceptance of a life-threatening and unnecessary practice.[43] The lurid vision of a one-breasted warrior woman, however, proved influential and has endured for centuries.

The title *androktones* or o*iorpata* ('man-killer')[44] is another facet of the modern Amazon for which supporting evidence is absent. She is renowned for having a hatred of men, implicitly resulting in the indiscriminate murder of men in war and peace, and, occasionally, of male children (for discussion of the latter, see below). She is frequently presented as living in a community or on an island composed only of women. However, once again, there is no material evidence to support the historical existence of a band of women-only warriors; even following immediately upon reporting they were called *oiorpata*, Herodotus recounts a story of a group of Amazon women accepting a group of Scythian men as life partners. Several stories feature individual Amazon women taking men for lovers or husbands; in artistic versions of Hippolyte, the Amazon is shown in courtship scenes with Heracles. Some versions of the Antiope myth say that she fell in love with Theseus and willingly became his wife in Athens. The legend of the Amazon queen Thalestris, recounted by several ancient Greek historians, claims that she requested to have sex with Alexander the Great in order to bear his child. The active presence of healthy men in Scythian society is materially witnessed by the high number of skeletons of male warriors across the steppes, more than double the number of female warrior skeletons. That occasionally skeletons of both sexes are found in the same grave points to, if nothing else, an absence of the furious hatred of men ascribed to Amazons. There is no basis for the label of Amazons as *androktones*.

A secondary consequence of their supposed hatred for men is the Amazons' reputation for maiming or disposing of their male children. It is likely that this element of the stereotype originates in a text in the Hippocratic Corpus, the surgical treatise *On Joints*, which opens by reporting the rumour that Amazons 'dislocate the joints of their male children while mere infants',[45] - but another text of the corpus, *On Airs*, *Waters*, *Places*, attributes lameness and hip-joint problems (and impotence) among Scythian men to a lifetime of horse-riding.[46] During Mayor's exploration of this element of the modern Amazon stereotype, she notes once again that Herodotus, with his keen eye for the odd or unusual, did not mention such a practice and wrote, instead, that nomad girls and boys were brought up alike.[47] She also speculates that rumours of men's lameness may have arisen because of hereditory or childhood hip dysplasia, found among Scythian skeletons by archaeologists. The latter is prevalent today among the nomadic Saami people and the nomads of Mongolia. As well, it is possible that, in common with medieval Highland Scots, Welsh, or Irish social practices, the Scythians practiced fosterage and thereby rise to the rumour that they 'sent away their sons'.[48]

This author accepts Mayor's thesis that the Amazons were Scythian nomads, male and female together, likely a tribe whose territory was north of the Black Sea area from ca. 750 to ca. 250 BCE; there is more evidence for it than any alternative theory, as outlined above. However, historians of

43 Horse archers, both male and female, hold the small recurve composite bow out and away from the chest and face when firing an arrow, as free motion by the rider on the horse and the motion of the horse itself demand it. As a result, the 'Parthian shot', fired backwards when the horse rides forwards, becomes possible. Mayor, 210-7.

44 Herodotus 4.110.

45 Hippocrates, *On Joints*, trans. Francis Adams (ca.400 BCE), http://classics.mit.edu/Hippocrates/artic.53.53.html, accessed 19 May 2019.

46 Hippocrates, *On Airs, Waters, and Places*, trans. Francis Adams (ca. 400 BCE), http://classics.mit.edu/Hippocrates/airwatpl.22.22.html, accessed 19 May 2019.

47 Herodotus,

48 Mayor, 45-9 and 155-8.

Antiquity such as Diodorus of Sicily (writing from 60-30 BCE),[49] Strabo (ca. 64 BCE – ca. 24 CE),[50] or Justin,[51] wrote and repeated stories about Amazons cauterizing a breast on girl children, mutilating or murdering boy children, hating men in general, or living in women-only bands of warriors (with visits by men for procreation). This established a stereotype with little resemblance to the Scythian women warriors and it is this image of the Amazon which predominates in today's Western culture, historically and today.

Moreover, and most pointedly for this article, the strength of the Amazon as a cultural concept meant that Europeans during the expansionist and colonialist eras were unable to recognize non-patriarchal sex and gender relationships (ie: matricultures) because they did not conform to the Western concept of the Amazon – virtually the only conceivable option available for societies where women and men did not organize themselves along patriarchal norms. The following section describes several instances of this failure of perception.

The Beast with One Breast

This above-described concept of the Amazon communicated itself to medieval Europeans as part of the inherited bundle of cultural heritage from Classical Greece and Rome. For example, Saint Isidore of Seville (ca. 560-636 CE) mentioned the cauterizing of breasts by Amazons in his *Etimologias*.[52] In his *Travels*, Marco Polo (1254–1324 CE) refers to an Island of Men and an Island of Women, where the men visit the women solely for procreation;[53] the eponymous author claims the same in *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (first circulating between 1357 and 1371 CE).[54] Jean Fonteneau, called Alfonse, de Saintonge (ca.1484-1544/49) identified the specific months where men visited the Amazons to make babies (April, May, and June) in his *La cosmographie avec l'espère et régime du soleil du nord*.[55]

Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375 CE) – who may have learned of Amazons from his friend Paolo de Perugia, a collector of Classical material - wrote a long poem entitled *Teseida delle Nozze d'Emilia*. Modeled after Statius' *Thebaid*, Boccaccio devoted the first book to an account of the reinvention of Theseus and Scythian Amazons as antagonists in a war to decide how women should live their lives. In the poem, Theseus invades Scythia – now depicted as 'the land of women', conquers it, and marries Ippolita, the Amazon queen. A few decades later, Geoffrey Chaucer (ca. 1343–1400)

49 Diodorus of Sicily 2.44-46, (ca.60-ca.30 BCE), http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Diodorus_Siculus/2B*.html, accessed 19 May 2019.

50 Strabo, *Geographica* 11.5.1 (ca. 20 BCE – ca. 23 CE), http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0198%3Abook%3D11%3Achapter%3D5%3Asection%3D1, accessed 10 May 2019.

51 Justinus, Marcus Junianus, *Epitome of the Phillipic History of Pompeius Trogus*, trans. John Selby Watson (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), 2.4, http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/justin/english/trans2.html, accessed 19 May 2019.

52 Isidore of Seville, Oxford Classical Texts: Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi: Etymologiarum Sive Originum, Vol. 1: Libros I–X, ed. W.M. Lindsay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911), Vol. 1, IX, par. 2, lines 62-5; http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/L/Roman/Texts/Isidore/9*.html, accessed 21 May 2019.

53 Rustichello da Pisa, *The Travels of Marco Polo (the complete Yule-Cordier edition)*, trans. Henry Yule, rev. Henri Cordier (ca. 1300), Bk. III, chapter 31; https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/p/polo/marco/travels/book3.31.html, accessed 21 May 2019.

54 Mandeville, Sir John, *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, The version of the Cotton Manuscript in modern spelling (London: MacMillan and Company, 1900), chapter XVII, p. 102; http://www.gutenberg.org/files/782/782-h/782-h.htm#page102, accessed 21 May 2019.

55 Fontenau, Jean, *La cosmographie avec l'espère et régime du soleil du nord par Jean Fonteneau dit Alfonse de Saintonge, capitaine-pilote de François Ier*, trans. And ed. Georges Musset (Paris, 1904), p. 233; https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6535486p/f249.item.r=Amazones, accessed 21 May 2019.

opened *Canterbury Tales* with 'The Knight's Tale' - whose hero, Theseus, conquered 'al the regne of Femenye, That whilom was ycleped Scithia'.[56] Theseus weds the Amazon queen, Hippolyta; this wedding frames the events of William Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, penned two centuries later.[57]

A hundred years before Shakespeare wrote his comedy, though, European explorers of the Americas already wrote of encountering Amazons. Influenced by both Mandeville and Marco Polo,[58] Christopher Columbus was ready to find a community of women hostile to men – and he did. On 6 January 1493, Columbus' journal notes that he has been told by many natives of an island upon which there were only women. He declares his interest in visiting, because he'd like to bring five or six of them to the monarchs of Spain.[59] In a letter to Luis de Santangel, composed six weeks later during his voyage back to Europe, Columbus further declared that the women did not follow the normal occupations of their sex, but were interested only in archery, that they armed themselves, and covered themselves with leather plates. The men with whom they (reportedly) mated were ferocious cannibals, the Caraib.[60]

Hernando Columbus expanded upon this in *Historia del Almirante*, the biography he wrote of his father. In it, he recounted that on 13 January 1493, a native told the Admiral that that the *Ïsla Matinino* was populated entirely by women with whom, at certain times of the year, the Caraib men had sexual relations. If the women gave birth to male children, they gave them to their fathers so they might raise them.[61] It should be noted that although both Columbuses evoked the myth of the Amazons, neither raised it explicity. It fell to Italian humanist Pietro Martyre d'Anghiera (1457-1526 CE) to openly make the connection in the histories he wrote while in service to the King of Spain. In the 1511 first Decade of *De Orbe Nova*, he wrote the following :

> Those natives who had been brought to Spain on his first voyage, and those who had been delivered from captivity, declared that it was called Madanina, and that it was inhabited exclusively by women. The Spaniards had, in fact, heard this island spoken of during their first voyage. It appeared that the cannibals went at certain epochs of the year to visit these women, as in ancient history the Thracians crossed to the island of Lesbos inhabited by the Amazons. When their children were weaned, they sent the boys to their fathers, but kept the girls, precisely as did the Amazons. It is claimed that these women know of vast caverns where they conceal themselves if any man tries to visit them at another than the established time. Should any one attempt to force his way into these caverns by violence or by trickery, they defend themselves with arrows, which they shoot with great precision.[62]

---

56 Chaucer, Geoffrey, *The Tales of Canterbury*, ed. Robert A. Platt (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), p. 26.

57 Anderson, David, *Before the Knight's Tale: Imitation of Classical Epic in Boccaccios Teseida*. Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988); p. 26.

58 Adams, Percy G., *Travel Literature Through the Ages* (New York: Garland, 1988), p. 53.

59 Columbus, Christopher, *The Journal of Christopher Columbus (During His First Voyage)*, ed. Clements R. Markham (Hakluyt Society, 1893; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 151, 165.

60 Columbus, Christopher, *The Spanish letter of Columbus to Luis de Sant' Angel, Escribano de Racion of the Kingdom of Aragon, dated 15 February 1493*, trans. M.P. Kerney (London: Quaritch. 1893), pp. 16-7.

61 Columbus, Hernando, *Historia del Almirante*, ed. Luis Arranz, Cronicas de America I (Madrid: Historia 16, 1984), chap. 36, pp. 138-9.

62 Martyre d'Anghiera, Pietro, *De Orbe Nova*, trans. Francis Augustus MacNutt, Vol. 1 (New York: Putnam, 1912), Decade 1, Book II; https://www.gutenberg.org/files/12425/12425-h/12425-h.htm, accessed 21 May 2019.

On 6 January 1493, Columbus was at the island now known as Hispaniola, likely near the border of Haiti and the Dominican Republic. The island was occupied by the Taíno people, whose society has been designated 'Classic Taíno' by archaeologist Irving Rouse and characterized by complex chiefdoms, social hierarchy, a horticultural economy based on root crops, and the highly artistic craft and ritual expressions associated with the Ostionoid cultural tradition.[63] The Taíno are reported to have traced descent through the female line, supported by the Taíno cosmogenic myth of descent from an immortal being who had a mother with five names and a maternal uncle. In practice, matrilineal descent was expressed in the inheritance of rank through the female line, with women sometimes inheriting chiefly position. *Zemis*, representations of the lineage's ancestors, were also passed through the female line and women are reported to have been both the producers and the distributors of certain high status goods. A new couple resided with his mother's brother in the village of his lineage, a viri-avunculocal residence pattern also recorded among the Trobriand Islanders, and Haida, Tlingit, Gitksan, and Longuda peoples. Taíno women seem to have participated at all levels in the political hierarchy, both wielding power and accumulating wealth. Male and female sexuality were openly expressed in Taíno art, and it appears that chastity was not valued for either gender.[64]

From all indications, the Taíno were a flourishing matriculture at the moment of Columbian contact, with significantly different conceptions of sex, sex roles, and gender relationships from European concepts and structures of the period and correspondingly different social expressions of them. The Taíno matricultural cultural system is socially visible to historians as, among other things, opportunities for women to experience status and authority, as the mother's brother playing a significant role with her children, as matrilineal inheritance of rank, and an open expression of women's sexual experience. These differences passed completely un-perceived by Columbus, whose attention on the issue was given to rumours of an island of Amazon-like inhabitants. It is unlikely that Columbus and the Spanish colonizers who followed would have behaved differently towards the Taíno if they had recognized the hitherto-unknown cultural system at play, nor that the tragic fate of the Indigenous society would have been different. However, recognizing today that a matricultural cultural system was central part of Taíno society is a small step towards acknowledging the nature of what was lost.

The influence on Europeans of Columbus' and Pietro Martyr's depiction of Amazon-like women in the New World is difficult to under-estimate; at the least, it served to give the stereotype new vitality. For example, in his 1510 novel *Las Sergas de Esplanadián*, Spanish novelist Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo described the following:

> Know that on the right hand from the Indies exists an island called *California* very close to a side of the Earthly Paradise; and it was populated by black women, without any man existing there, because they lived in the way of the Amazons. They had beautiful and robust bodies, and were brave and very strong. Their island was the strongest of the World, with its steep cliffs and rocky shores. Their weapons were golden and so were the harnesses of the wild beasts that they were accustomed to taming so that they could be ridden, because there was no other metal in the island than gold.[65]

63 Rouse, Irving, *The Tainos: Rise and Decline of the People Who Greeted Columbus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 9-17.

64 Deagan, Kathleen, 'Reconsidering Taíno Social Dynamic after Spanish Conquest: Gender and Class in Culture Contact Studies', *American Antiquity*, 69:4 (2004), pp. 597- (pp. 600-1).

65 Rodriguez de Montalvo, Garci, *Las Sergas de Esplanadian* (acosta y espensa de Juan de Junta, 1526), Ch. clvii.

The novel was popular and enjoyed several editions. Hernan Cortés (1485-1547 CE), writing in 1524 of an expedition he sent to the Pacific coast, describes how the returning *conquistadors* told of seeing an island off the coast of Cihuatlan where only women lived, where men were allowed to approach for reproduction only at certain times, and where boy babies were rejected. Cortés added a detail missing from Columbus' accounts: the island was rich in pearls and gold.[66] Cortés' account was repeated three times by Fernández de Oviedo in *La historia general y natural de las Indias* (1851-55), and twice by Franciso Cervantes de Salazar in his unfinished *Crónica de la Nueva España* (1560?) When the Spanish later began to explore and settle the Pacific coast, they named the area *Las Californias*; as its peninsular nature began to be known, the name settled to California.

Spanish historian Francisco López de Gómara (ca. 1511-ca.1566 CE), in writing about the Lucayan Archipelago in 1552, described the Indigenous people as very beautiful. He attributed this as the reason for which men from surrounding islands visited, and 'this likely being the cause of rumours about Amazons in this region'.[67] The Lucayan people were a branch of the Taino culture; like them, matrilineal, and like them, dispossessed of their territory within a few decades of European arrival.

This concludes Part I of this exploration of the European encounter with matricultures from Antiquity to the present, and the manner in which, thanks to a cultural bias towards the concept of the one-breasted, man-hating Amazon, Westerners did not perceive the many prospering Indigenous matricultural cultural systems which they met. This part has defined the concept of a cultural system, identified key characteristics of matricultural cultural systems, discussed current research on the Amazons and positioned them as nomadic matricultural Scythians, outlined a deepening misconception of the Amazons among Classical authors and traced changes and developments in the mistaken concept through Europe's mediaeval period. After an example of Columbus' distraction by the idea of the Amazon during his visits to the Caribbean, a distraction which completely occluded the flourishing matricultural system of the Taíno people who provided him and his crew with necessary supplies, this part concludes by describing the effect of the Columbian encounter on the already-distorted concept of the Amazon.

Parts II and III will be published in future issues of *Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies*. The article progresses chronologically; Part II will conclude the section on Europe's Age of Exploration and begin the Age of Colonialism. Part III will conclude the Age of Colonialism and delve into the relationship of the modern Western gaze and contemporary matricultural societies.

66 Cortés, Hernán, 'Cuarta Carta-Relación de Hernán Cortés al Emperador Carlos V, Tenuxtitlan, 15 octobre de 1524', in Hernán Cortés, *Cartas de Relación*, ed. Pascual de Gayangos (Paris: Imprenta Central de los Ferro-Carriles, 1866), p. 288.

67 López de Gómara, Francisco, 'Hispania Victrix. Primera y Segunda Parte de la Historia General de las Indias, con todo el descubrimiento, y cosas notables que han acaecido desde que se ganaron haste el ano de 1551 ; con la conquista de Mejico y de la Nueva-Espana', in *Historiadores Primitivos de Indias*, *t.I.* (Madrid: Atlas, 1946), col. "B.A.E.", no. 22, pp. 155-455 (p. 178)

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 29 - 30

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Introduction to Peggy Reeves Sanday's "The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape. A Cross-Cultural Study." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 17, No. 4, 1981.

PAULINE MCKENZIE-AUCOIN, PhD

The research and analysis conducted by Peggy Reeves Sanday in the 1980's, and the resulting 'social science argument' (Presley 2015) that she put forward to explain differences in the incidence of rape recorded in different cultures, marks a landmark that set an unequivocable standard for social science research and theory at that time. Through analysis of extensive ethnographic data collected from societies around the world, Sanday systematically compared the different conditions of life for women and men in order to identify cultural factors that might influence the varying incidence of violence, and in particular rape, in different societies. Writing at a time when theory, notably in the field of socio-biology, still drew from conjectural, reconstructed histories of behaviour that were argued to be an expression of our biological inheritance – that is, our 'human nature', the importance of her argument that learned cultural attitudes, behaviour and conditions influence the incidence of rape for all societies – including our own – cannot be overstated. Her study of the socio-cultural context of rape marks a turning point in the social science of violence and its place in the preservation of relationships of gender inequality around the world.

Sanday's approach to understanding factors that affect rape incidence, which she refers to as the etiology of rape, is significant for a number of reasons. Firstly, by drawing on an extensive data set, her analysis was able to explore a multitude of practices and meanings of sex relationships, and in so doing, discern what does or does not constitute rape or non-consensual sex - heterosexual or homosexual, amongst adults or between adults and children within particular societies, a discussion that continues today (see Ananthaswamy and Douglas 2018). Contrary to other findings at this time, her research confirmed that as the incidence of rape varies cross-culturally, it is *not* a universal; with societies falling into rape free, intermediate and rape prone categories. A rape free society is one in which rape is infrequent or does not occur; and these societies constituted 47% of the societies studied. A rape prone society is one in which rape can be said to be "culturally allowable, or largely overlooked" (Sanday 1981 9), and in which "the incidence of rape is high, rape

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture.
This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

is a ceremonial act, or rape is an act by which men punish or threaten women" (Sanday 1981 5). This type of society constituted 18% of the cultures in Sanday's sample.

By studying the characteristics of societies described in numerous ethnographic cases, Sanday has been able to identify what similar conditions exist in different societies that are contributing to the lesser or higher occurrence of rape, differences that are statistically significant. Drawing from her own long-term anthropological research within the matrilineal society of the Minangkabau in Indonesia, she demonstrated that the socio-cultural contexts for rape free and rape prone societies are markedly different, and these findings are central to our current understanding of the bases for gender equality versus hierarchy. In rape free societies, men and women are valued equally, their roles are complementary, and women's ceremonial importance is as high as that of men. In contrast, rape prone societies are characterized by interpersonal violence, sexual separation, aggressive sexual relations, and male dominance expressed through social control and the devaluing of women's contributions, as well as in mythology that promotes a male-dominance ideology supporting and reflecting relations of inequality.

Sanday's later studies (1996) of sexual violence have drawn analyses of rape in American society into her explanations of gender and power, holding up contemporary instances of the gang rape of female students on university campuses and perpetuated in fraternities to illustrate parallels between cultures of male violence and dominance in Western and non-Western contexts. This work has contributed significantly to the definition and understanding of what has come to be known as rape culture, as well as highlighting the need to develop those socializing strategies that must be employed in order to support gender respect and equality. In this last endeavour, Sanday's work to develop the field of Public Interest Anthropology has been recognized (AAA 2015) recently for applying the insights gained from anthropological research towards furthering gender equality.

References cited

American Anthropological Association (AAA) Media Release, July 27, 2015. "Peggy Sanday Honored for Contributions to Gender Equity in Anthropology." Announcement of the AAA Committee on Gender Equity Award (CoGEA). Available online at : https://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/issues/press/upload/2015-CoGEA-Award.pdf

Ananthaswamy, Anil and Kate Douglas 2018. The ascent of man, *New Scientist*. 4/21/2018, Vol. 238 Issue 3174, p33-39.

Presley, Sharon, "Rape Culture:" Yea or Nay? Column for Libertarianism.org published April 16, 2015. Available online at: https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/rape-culture-yea-or-nay

Sanday, Peggy Reeves 1996. Rape-Prone Versus Rape-Free Campus Cultures. *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 2 No. 2, June, 1996, pp. 191- 208.

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 31 - 46

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

This article was originally published in the *JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES* VOLUME 37, NUMBER 4, 1981. This is a REPRINT of that seminal article, with permission of the author.

The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape. A Cross-Cultural Study[1]

PEGGY REEVES SANDAY, PhD
University of Pennsylvania

This research departs from the familiar assumption that rape is an inherent tendency of male nature, and begins with the assumption that human sexual behavior, though based in a biological need, is an expression of cultural fortes. The incidence, meaning, and function of rape in a cross-cultural sample of tribal societies are presented. Two general hypotheses guide the research: first, the incidence of rape varies cross-culturally; second, a high incidence of rape is embedded in a distinguishably different cultural configuration than a low incidence of rape. The data suggest that rape is part of a cultural configuration which includes interpersonal violence, male dominance, and sexual separation. Rape is interpreted as the sexual expression of these forces in societies where the harmony between men and their environment has been severely disrupted.

In her comprehensive and important analysis of rape, Susan Brownmiller says that “when men discovered that they could rape, they proceeded to do it” and that “from prehistoric time to the present rape has played a critical function” (1975, p. 14-15). The critical function to which Brownmiller refers has been “to keep all women in a constant state of intimidation, forever conscious of the knowledge that the biological tool must be held in awe for it may turn to weapon with sudden swiftness borne of ..harmful intent” (1975, p. 209).

Brownmiller's attribution of violence to males and victimisation to females strums a common theme in Western social commentary on the nature of human nature. Most of the popularizers of this theme present what amounts to a socio-biological view of human behavior which traces war, violence, and now rape to the violent landscape of our primitive ancestors. where, early on, the male tendency in these directions became genetically programmed in the fight for survival of the fittest. Human (viz. male) nature is conceived as an ever present struggle to

1This research was supported by Grant No. ROI MH 28978 awarded by the National Institute of Mental Health. I am grateful to Gloria Levin, former Deputy Chief of the National Center for the Prevention and Control Rape, who administered this grant. Correspondence regarding this article may be addressed to Dr. Peggy Reeves Sanday, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania. University Museum F-l, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

© 2020 The Author(s). Reprinted by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture, with permission of the author. Copyright reverts to John Wiley and Sons Group Company.

overcome baser impulses bequeathed by “apish” ancestors. (For examples of this general theme, see Ardrey, 1966; Lorenz, 1966; Tiger, 1969.)

The research described in the present paper departs from the familiar assumption that male nature is programmed for rape, and begins with another familiar, albeit less popular, assumption that human sexual behavior, though based in a biological need “is rather a sociological and cultural force than a mere bodily relation of two individuals” (Malinowski, 1929, p. xxiii). With this assumption in mind, what follows is an examination of the socio-cultural context of sexual assault and an attempt to interpret its meaning. By understanding the meaning of rape, we can then make conjectures as to its function. Is it, as Susan Brownmiller suggests, an act that keeps all women in a constant state of intimidation, or is it an act that illuminates a larger social scenario?

This paper examines the incidence, meaning, and function of rape in tribal societies. Two general hypotheses guided the research: first, the incidence of rape varies cross-culturally; second, a high incidence of rape is embedded in a distinguishably different cultural configuration than a low incidence of rape. Using a standard cross-cultural sample of 156 tribal societies. the general objectives of the paper are:

l. to provide a descriptive profile of ‘rape prone’ and ‘rape free’ societies;
2. to present an analysis of the attitudes, motivations, and socio-cultural factors related to the incidence of rape.

Description of the Evidence

In most societies for which information on rape was available, rape is an act in which a male or a group of males sexually assaulted a woman. Jn a few cases, descriptions of women sexually assaulting a male or homosexual rape are reported. This study, however, was oriented exclusively to the analysis of rape committed by males against women.

The standard cross-cultural sample published by Murdock and White (1969) formed the basis for this research. This sample offers to scholars a representative sample of the world’s known and well-described societies. The complete sample consists of 186 societies, each ‘pinpointed’ to an identifiable subgroup of the society in question at a specific point in time. The time period the sample societies ranges from 1750 B.C. (Babylonians) to the late 1960's. The societies included in the standard sample are distributed relatively equally among the following six major regions of the world: Sub-Saharan Africa, Circum-Mediterranean. East Eurasia, Insular Pacific, North America, South and Central America.

This analysis of rape was part of a larger study on the origins of sexual inequality (see Sanday, 1981). Due to the amount of missing information on the variables included in this larger study, thirty of the standard sample societies were excluded, reducing the final sample size to 156. Since many of the variables include in the larger study were pertinent to the analysis of the sociocultural context of rape, the same sample was employed here.

The information for coding the variables came from codes published in the journal *Ethnology*; library materials; and the Human Relations Area Files. The data obtained from the latter two sources were coded by graduate students in anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania using codes developed by me on one-third of the standard sample societies. When the coding was

completed, a random sample of societies was selected for checking. The percentage of items on which coders and checkers agreed averaged 88% of the 21 variables checked for each society. Disagreements were resolved either by myself or still another coder after rechecking the material.

There was a significant discrepancy between the number of societies for which information was obtained on rape for this study and that obtained by other authors employing the same sample. Broude and Greene (1976) were able to find information on the frequency of rape in only 34 of the standard sample societies, whereas for this study information was obtained for 95 of these societies. This discrepancy raises questions about the operational definitions of rape employed in the coding.

Although the codes used in the two studies were similar, my definition of 'rape prone' included cases in which men rape enemy women, rape is a ceremonial act, and rape may be more a threat used by men to control women in certain ways than an actuality. Broude and Greene appear to have excluded such incidents from their coding and to have focused only on the intra-societal incidence of uncontrolled rape. The differences in these operational definitions are apparent from the information presented in Table l.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TWO CODES FOR RAPE

Society #[a]	Society name	Sanday Code[b] Rape Code	Type of rape[c]	Broude & Greene Code[b]
11	Kikuyu	3	Ceremonial rape	No information
19	Ashanti	1	Rape is rare or absent	No information
13	Mbuti	1	Rape is rare or absent	Agrees with Sanday Code
14	Mongo	1	Rape is rare or absent	Agrees with Sanday Code
28	Azande	3	Rape of enemy women Rape cases reported	Disagrees (Rape rare)
41	Tuareg	1	Rape is rare or absent	No information
60	Gond	1	Rape is rare or absent	No information
66	Mon gols	1	Rape is rare or absent	No information
70	Lakher	1	Rape is rare or absent	Agrees with Sanday Code
91	A run ta	3	Ceremonial rape	No information
108	Marshallese	3	Gang rape is accepted	Agrees with Sanday Code
127	Saulteaux	3	Rape used as threat	No information
143	Omaha	3	Rape used as punishment	Disagrees (Rape absent)
158	Cuna	1	Rape is rare or absent	Agrees with Sanday Code
163	Yanomamo	3	Rape of enemy women	Agrees with Sanday Code
166	Mundurucu	3	Rape used as punishment	Agrees with Sanday Code
169	Jivaro	1	Rape is rare or absent	No information
179	Shavante	3	Rape used as punishment	No information

[a] Refers to standard sample number listed by Murdock and White (1969).
[b] See Table 2 for the two rape codes.
[c] For each of the societies listed, the ethnographic descriptions of the incidence of rape are presented later in this paper.

A sub-sample of societies are listed in Table 1 along with the codes used in this study and the code given by Broude and Greene (1976). Broude and Greene report no information in nine societies where information on the incidence of rape was recorded in this study. The two codes agree in seven out of the remaining nine and disagree in two cases. Broude and Greene report that among the Azande rape is a rare occurrence while in this study the Azande were classified as rape prone due to the practice of raiding for wives. Broude and Greene report that rape is absent among the Omaha, whereas I found evidence from several sources that rape is present. The ethnographic descriptions which led to my rape codes for the eighteen societies listed in Table 1 can be found in the following sections profiling ‘rape prone’ and ‘rape free’ societies.

Broude and Greene (1976) find that rape is absent or rare in 59 percent of the 34 societies for which they found information on the frequency of rape (see Table 2). They say that rape is “common, not atypical” in the remaining 41 percent. In this study, forty-seven percent of the societies were classified as ‘rape free’; 35 percent were classified in an intermediate category; and 18 percent were classified as ‘rape prone’ (see Table 2). Thus both studies support the first general hypothesis of this study: sexual assault is *not* a universal characteristic of tribal societies. The incidence of rape varies cross-culturally.

Profiles of 'Rape Prone' Societies

In this study a ‘rape prone’ society was defined as one in which the incidence of rape is high, rape is a ceremonial act, or rape is an act by which men punish or threaten women.

An example of a ‘rape prone’ society is offered by Robert LeVine's (1959) description of sexual offenses among the Gusii of southwestern Kenya. In the European legal system which administers justice in the District where the Gusii live, a heterosexual assault is classified as rape when a medical examination indicates that the hymen of the alleged victim was recently penetrated by the use of painful force. When medical evidence is unobtainable, the case is classified as “indecent assault.” Most cases are of the latter kind. The Gusii do not distinguish between rape and indecent assault. They use the following expressions to refer to heterosexual assault: “to fight” (a girl or woman); “to stamp on” (a girl or woman); “to spoil” (a girl or woman); “to engage in illicit intercourse.” All of these acts are considered illicit by the Gusii. LeVine uses the term rape “to mean the culturally disvalued use of coercion by a male to achieve the submission of a female to sexual intercourse” (1959, p. 965).

TABLE 2
CROSS-CULTURAL INCIDENCE OF RAPE

Sanday Code	No. and % of Societies		Broude & Greene (1976:417) Code	No. and % of Societies	
Incidence of Rape (RA4) —	N	%	Frequency of Rape	N	%
l. *Rape Free*. Rape is reported as rare or absent.	45	47%	l. Absent	8	24%
2. Rape is reported as present, no report of frequency or any suggestion that rape is not atypical.	33	35%	2. Rare; isolated	12	35%
3. *Rape Prone*. Rape is an accepted practice used to punish women, as part of a ceremony, or is *clearly* an act of moderate to high frequency carried out against own women or women of other societies	17	18%	3. Common; not atypical	14	41%
TOTAL	95	100%		34	100%

Based on court records for 1955 and 1956 LeVine estimates that the annual rate of rape is 47.2 per 100,000 population. LeVine believes that this figure grossly underestimates the Gusii rape rate. During the same period the annual rape rate in urban areas of the United States was 13.85 per 100,000 (13.1 for rural areas). Thus, the rate of Gusii rape is extraordinarily high.

Normal heterosexual intercourse between Gusii males and females is conceived as an act in which a man overcomes the resistance of a woman and causes her pain. When a bride is unable to walk after her wedding night, the groom is considered by his friends "a real man" and he is able to boast of his exploits, particularly if he has been able to make her cry. Older women contribute to the groom's desire to hurt his new wife. These women insult the groom, saying:

> "You are not strong, you can't do anything to our daughter. When you slept with her you didn't do it like a man. You have a small penis which can do nothing. You should grab our daughter and she should be hurt and scream—then you're a man" (LeVine, 1959, p. 969).
> The groom answers boastfully:
> "I am a man! If you were to see my penis you would run away. When I grabbed her she screamed. I am not a man to be joked with. Didn't she tell you? She cried—ask her!" (LeVine, 1959, p. 969).

Thus, as LeVine says, (1959, 971) "legitimate heterosexual encounters among the Gusii are aggressive contests, involving force and pain-inflicting behavior." Under circumstances that are not legitimate, heterosexual encounters are classified as rape when the girl chooses to report the act.

LeVine estimates that the typical Gusii rape is committed by an unmarried young man on an unmarried female of a different clan. He distinguishes between three types of rape: rape resulting from seduction, premeditated sexual assault, and abduction (1959).

Given the hostile nature of Gusii sexuality, seduction classifies as rape when a Gusii female chooses to bring the act to the attention of the public. Premarital sex is forbidden, but this does not stop Gusii boys from trying to entice girls to intercourse. The standard pose of the Gusii girl is reluctance, which means that is difficult for the boy to interpret her attitude as being either willing or unwilling. Misunderstandings between girl and boy can be due to the eagerness of the boy and his inability to perceive the girl's cues of genuine rejection, or to the to the girl's failure to make the signs of refusal in unequivocal fashion. The boy may discover the girl's unwillingness only after he has forced himself on her.

Fear of discovery may turn a willing girl into one who cries rape. If a couple engaging in intercourse out of doors is discovered, the girl may decide to save her reputation by crying out that she was being raped. Rape may also occur in cases when a girl has encouraged a young man to present her with gifts, but then denies him sexual intercourse. If the girl happens to be married, she rejects the boy's advances because she is afraid of supernatural sanctions against adultery. Out of frustration, the boy (who may not know that the girl is married) may resort to rape and she reports the deed.

In some cases one or more boys may attack a single girl in premeditated sexual assault. The boys may beat the girl badly and tear her clothing. Sometimes the girl is dragged off to the hut

of one of them and forced into coitus. After being held for a couple of days the girl is freed. In these cases rupture of the hymen and other signs of attack are usually present.

The third type of rape occurs in the context of wife abduction. When a Gusii man is unable to present the bridewealth necessary for a normal marriage and cannot persuade a girl to elope, he may abduct a girl from a different clan. The man's friends will be enlisted to carry out the abduction. The young men are frequently rough on the girl, beating her and tearing her clothes. When she arrives at the home of the would-be lover, he attempts persuade her to remain with him until bridewealth can be raised. Her refusal is ignored and the wedding night sexual contest is performed with the clansmen helping in overcoming her resistance.

Of these three types of rape, the first and third are unlawful versions of legitimate patterns. Seduction is accepted when kept within the bounds of discretion. Abduction is an imitation of traditional wedding procedures. Abduction lacks only the legitimizing bridewealth and the consent of the bride and her parents. In both of these cases Levine says, "there is a close parallel between the criminal act and the law-abiding culture pattern to which it is related." Seduction and abduction classify as rape when the girl chooses to report the incident.

Data collected from the standard cross-cultural sample allows us to place the hostility characterizing Gusii heterosexual behavior in cross-cultural perspective. Broude and Greene (1976), who published codes for twenty sexual practices, find that male sexual advances are occasionally or typically hostile in one-quarter (26%) of the societies for which information was available. They found that males were typically forward in verbal (not physical) sexual overtures in forty percent of the societies, that females solicited or desired physical aggression in male sexual overtures in eleven percent of the societies, and that males did not make sexual overtures or were diffident or shy in twenty-three percent of the societies.

Examination of a variety of 'rape prone' societies shows that the Gusii pattern of rape is found elsewhere but that it is by no means the only pattern which can be observed. For example, in several societies the act of rape occurs to signal readiness for marriage and is a ceremonial act. Since this act signifies male domination of female genitals, its occurrence was treated as a diagnostic criterion for classification as 'rape prone.'

Among the Kikuyu of East Africa it is reported that in former times, as part of initiation, every boy was expected to perform the act of ceremonial rape called *Kuihaka muunya* (to smear oneself with salt earth) in order to prove his manhood. It was thought that until a boy had performed the act of rape he could not have lawful intercourse with a Kikuyu woman and hence could not marry. During the initiation period boys would wander the countryside in bands of up to 100 in number. The object of each band was to find a woman on whom to commit the rape. The ideal woman was one from an enemy tribe who was married. In practice it appears that the ceremonial rape consisted of nothing more than masturbatory ejaculation on the woman's body or in her presence. Immediately after the act the boy was able to throw away the paraphernalia which marked him with the status of neophite (Lambert, 1956).

Rape marks a girl as marriageable among the Arunta of Australia. At age 14 or 15 the Arunta girl is taken out into the bush by a group of men for the vulva cutting ceremony. A designated man cuts the girl's vulva after which she is gang raped by a group of men which does not include her

future husband. When the ceremony is concluded the girl is taken to her husband and from then on no one else has the right of access to her. (Spencer & Gillen, 1927).

In other rape prone societies, rape is explicitly linked to the control of women and to male dominance. Among the Northern Saulteaux the assumption of male dominance is clearly expressed in the expectation that a man's potential sexual rights over the woman he chooses must be respected. A woman who turns a man down too abruptly insults him and invites aggression. There is a Northern Saulteaux tale about a girl who was considered too proud because she refused to marry. Accordingly, a group of medicine men lured her out into the bush where she was raped by each in turn (Hallowell, 1955). Such tales provide women with a fairly good idea of how they should behave in relation to men.

The attitude that women are "open" for sexual assault is frequently found in the societies of the Insular Pacific. For example, in the Marshall Islands one finds the belief that "every women is like a passage." Just as every canoe is permitted to sail from the open sea into the lagoon through the passage, so every man is permitted to have intercourse with every woman (except those who are excluded on account of blood kinship). A trader, well acquainted with the language and customs of one group of Marshall Islanders, reported the following incident. One day while standing at the trading post he saw 20 young men enter the bushes, one after another. Following the same path, he discovered a young girl stretched out on the ground, rigid and unconscious. When he accused the young men of cruel treatment they replied: "It is customary here for every young man to have intercourse with every girl" (Erdland, 1914, p. 98—99).

In tropical forest societies of South America and in Highland New Guinea it is fairly frequent to find the threat of rape used to keep women from the men's houses or from viewing male sacred objects. For example, Shavante women were strictly forbidden to observe male sacred ceremonies. Women caught peeking are threatened with man handling, rape, and disfigurement (Maybury-Lewis, 1967).

Perhaps the best known example of rape used to keep women away from male ritual objects is found in the description of the Mundurucu, a society well known to anthropologists due to the work of Robert and Yolanda Murphy. The Mundurucu believe that there was a time when women ruled and sex roles were reversed with the exception that women could not hunt. During that time, it is said, women were the sexual aggressors and men were sexually submissive and did women's work. Women controlled the "sacred trumpets" (the symbols of power) and the men's houses. The trumpets are believed to contain the spirits of the ancestors who demand ritual offering of meat. Since women did not hunt and could not make these offerings, men were able to take the trumpets from them, thereby establishing male dominance. The trumpets are secured in special chambers within the men's houses and no woman can see them under penalty of gang rape. Such a threat is necessary because men believe that women will attempt to seize from the men the power they once had. Gang rape is also the means by which men punish sexually "wanton" women (Murphy & Murphy, 1974).

Another expression of male sexual aggressiveness, which is classified as rape in this study, is the practice of sexually assaulting enemy women during warfare. The Yanomamo, described by Napoleon Chagnon and Marvin Harris, are infamous for their brutality toward women. The Yanomamo, according to Harris (1977), "practice an especially brutal form of male supremacy involving polygyny, frequent wife beating, and gang rape of captured enemy women." The

Yanomamo, Harris says, “regard fights over women as the primary causes of their wars” (1977, p. 69). Groups raid each other for wives in an area where marriageable women are in short supply due to the practice of female infanticide. The number of marriageable women is also affected by the desire on the part of successful warriors to have several wives to mark their superior status as “fierce men.” A shortage of women for wives also motivates Azande (Africa) warfare. Enemy women were taken by Azande soldiers as wives. Evans-Pritchard calls these women “slaves of war” and says that they were “not regarded very differently from ordinary wives, their main disability being that they had no family or close kin to turn to in times of trouble” (1971, p. 251). The absence of close kin, of course, made these women more subservient and dependent on their husbands.

Another source on the Azande discusses how the act of rape when committed against an Azande woman is treated. If the women is not married, this source reports, the act is not treated as seriously. If the woman is married, the rapist can be put to death by the husband. If the rapist is allowed to live, he may be judged guilty of adultery and asked to pay the chief 20 knives (the commonly used currency in marriage exchanges) and deliver a wife to the wronged husband. This source indicates that the rape of a woman is not permitted but the punishments are established, suggesting that rape is a frequent occurrence (Lagae,1926).

Among some American Indian buffalo hunters, it is not uncommon to read that rape is used as a means to punish adultery. There is a practice among the Cheyenne of the Great Plains known as “to put a woman on the prairie.” This means that the outraged husband of an adulterous woman invites all the unmarried members of his military society to feast on the prairie where they each rape the woman (Hoebel, 1960). Among the Omaha, a woman with no immediate kin who commits adultery may be gang raped and abandoned by her husband (Dorsey, 1884). Mead reports that the Omaha considered a “bad woman” fair game for any man. No discipline, no set of standards, other than to be cautious of an avenging father or brother and to obey the rule of exogamy, Mead says, kept young men from regarding rape as a great adventure. Young Omaha men, members of the Antler society, would prey upon divorced women or women considered loose (Mend. 1932).

Summarizing, a rape prone society, as defined here, is one in which sexual assault by men of women is either culturally allowable or largely overlooked. Several themes interlink the above descriptions. In all, men are posed as social group against women. Entry into the adult male or female group is marked in some cases by rituals that include rape. In other cases, rape preserves the ceremonial integrity of the male group and signifies its status vis-a-vis women. The theme of women as property is suggested when the aggrieved husband is compensated for the rape of his wife by another man, or when an adulterous woman is gang raped by her husband and his unmarried compatriots. In these latter cases, the theme of the dominant male group is joined with a system of economic exchange in which men act as exchange agents and women comprise the medium of exchange. This is not to say that rape exists in all societies in which there is ceremonial induction into manhood, male secret societies, or compensation for adultery. For further illumination of the cultural context of rape we can turn to an examination of rape free societies.

Profiles of "Rape Free" Societies

Rape free societies are defined as those where the act of rape is either infrequent or does not occur. Forty-seven percent of the societies for which information on the incidence or presence of rape was available (see Table 2) were classified in the rape free category. Societies were classified

in this category on the basis of the following kinds of statements found in the sources used for the sample societies.

Among the Taureg of the Sahara, for example, it is said that “rape does not exist, and when a woman refuses a man, he never insists nor will he show himself jealous of a more successful comrade” (Blanguernon, 1955, p. 13/1). Among the Pygmies of the Ituri forest in Africa, while a boy may rip off a girl’s outer bark cloth, if he can catch her he may never have intercourse with her without her permission. Turnbull (1965), an anthropologist who lived for some time among the Pygmies and became closely identified with them, reports that he knew of no cases of rape. Among the Jivaro of South America rape is not recognized as such, and informants could recall no case of a woman violently resisting sexual intercourse. They say that a man would never commit such an act if the woman resisted, because she would tell her family and they would punish him. Among the Nkundo Mongo of Africa it is said that rape in the sense of the word - that is, the abuse of a woman by the use of' violence - is most unusual. If a woman does not consent, the angry seducer leaves her, often insulting her to the best of his ability. Rape is also unheard of among the Lakhers, and in several villages the anthropologist was told that there had never been a case of rape.

Other examples of statements leading to the classification of rape free are listed as follows:

> Cuna (South America), “Homosexuality is rare, as is rape. Both... are regarded as sins, punishable by God" (Stout, 1947, p. 39).
> Khalka Mongols (Outer Mongolia), “I put this question to several well-informed Mongols: - what punishment is here imposed for rape? … one well-educated lama said frankly: “We have no crimes of this nature here. Our women never resist,” (Maiskii, 1921, p. 98).
> Gond (India), “It is considered very wrong to force a girl to act against her will. Such cases of ghotul-rape are not common... If then a boy forces a girl against her will, and the others hear of it, he is fined” (Elwin, 47, p, 056).

The above quotes may obscure the actual incidence of rape. Such quotes, leading to the classification of societies as ‘rape free’, achieve greater validity when placed within the context of other information describing heterosexual interaction.

There is considerable difference in the character of heterosexual interaction in societies classified as ‘rape prone’ when compared with those classified as ‘rape free’. In ‘rape free’ societies women are treated with considerable respect, and prestige is attached to female reproductive and productive roles. Interpersonal violence is minimized, and a people’s attitude regarding the natural environment is one of reverence rather than one of exploitation Turnbull’s description of the Mbuti Pygmies, of the Ituri forest in Africa, provides a prototypical profile of a ‘rape free’ society (1965).

Violence between the sexes, or between anybody, is virtually absent among the net hunting Mbuti Pygmies when they are in their forest environment. The Mbuti attitude toward the forest is reflective of their attitude toward each other. The forest is addressed as “father,” “mother,” “lover,” and “friend.” The Mbuti say that forest is everything - the provider of food, shelter, warmth, clothing, and affection. Each person and animal is endowed with some spiritual power which “derives from a single source whose physical manifestation is the forest itself.” The ease of the Mbuti relationship to their environment is reflected in the relationship between the sexes. There is little division of labor by sex. The hunt is frequently a joint effort. A man is not ashamed to pick

mushrooms and nuts if he finds them: or to wash and clean a baby. In general, leadership is minimal and there is no attempt to control, or to dominate, either the geographical or human environment. Decision-making is by common consent; men and women have equal say because hunting and gathering are both important to the economy. The forest is the only recognized authority of last resort. In decision making, diversity of opinion may be expressed, but prolonged disagreement is considered to be “noise” and offensive to the forest. If husband and wife disagree, the whole camp may act to mute their antagonism, lest the disagreement become too disruptive to the social unit (see Turnbull, 1965).

The essential details of Turnbull’s idyllic description of the Mbuti are repeated in other ‘rape free’ societies. The one outstanding feature of these societies is the ceremonial importance of women and the respect accorded the contribution women make to social continuity, a respect which places men and women in relatively balanced power spheres. This respect is clearly present among the Mbuti and in more complex ‘rape free’ societies.

In the West African kingdom of Ashanti, for example, it is -believed that only women can contribute to future generations. Ashanti women say:

> I am the mother of the man. … I alone can transmit the blood to a king. … If my sex die in the clan then that very clan becomes extinct, for be there one, or one thousand male members left, not one can transmit the blood, and the life of the clan becomes measured on this earth by the span of a man’s life (Rattray, 1923, p. 79).

The importance of the feminine attributes of growth and reproduction are found in Ashanti religion and ritual. Priestesses participate with priests in all major rituals. The Ashanti creation story emphasizes the complementarity and inseparability of male and female. The main female deity, the Earth Goddess, is believed to be the receptacle of past and future generations as well as the source of food and water (Rattray, 1923, 1927). The sacred linkage of earth-female-blood makes the act of rape incongruous in Ashanti culture. Only one incident of rape is reported by the main ethnographer of the Ashanti. In this case the man involved was condemned to death (Rattray, 1927, p. 21 1).

In sum, rape free societies are characterized by sexual equality and the notion that the sexes are complementary. Though the sexes may not perform the same duties or have the same rights or privileges, each is indispensable to the activities of the other (see Sanday, 1981 for examples of sexual equality). The key to understanding the relative absence of rape in rape free as opposed to rape prone societies is the importance, which in some cases is sacred, attached to the contribution women make to social continuity. As might be expected, and as will be demonstrated below, interpersonal violence is uncommon in rape free societies. It is not that men are necessarily prone to rape; rather, where interpersonal violence is a way of life, violence frequently achieves sexual expression.

Approaches to the Etiology of Rape

Three general approaches characterize studies of the etiology of rape. One approach focuses on the broader sociocultural milieu, another turns to individual characteristics. The first looks at how rapists act out the broader social script, the second emphasizes variables like the character of parental-child interaction. A third approach, which may focus on either individual or social factors, is distinguishable by the assumption that male sexual repression will inevitably erupt

in the form of sexual violence. These approaches, reviewed briefly in this section, guided the empirical analysis of the socio-cultural context of rape in tribal societies.

Based on his study of the Gusii, LeVine (1959) that four factors will be associated with the incidence cross-culturally:

l. severe formal restrictions on the nonmarital sexual relations of females;
2. moderately strong sexual inhibitions on the part of females;
3. economic or other barriers to marriage that prolong the bachelorhood of some males into their late twenties;
4. the absence of physical segregation of the sexes.

The implicit assumption here is that males who are denied sexual access to women, will obtain access by force unless men are separated from women. Such an assumption depicts men as creatures who cannot control their sexual impulses, and women as the unfortunate victims.

Le Vine's profile of' the Gusii suggests that broader social characteristics are related to the incidence of rape. For example, there is the fact that marriage among the Gusii occurs almost always between feuding clans. The Gusii have a proverb which states “Those whom we marry are those whom we fight” (1959, p. 966). The close correspondence between the Gusii heterosexual relationship and intergroup hostilities suggests the hypothesis that the nature of intergroup relations is correlated with the nature of the heterosexual relationship and the incidence of rape.

The broader approach to the etiology of rape is contained in Susan Brownmiller's contention that rape is the means by which men keep women in a state of fear. This contention is certainly justified in societies where men use rape as a threat to keep women from viewing their sacred objects (the symbol of power) or rape is used to punish women. In societies like the Mundurucu, the ideology of male dominance is upheld by threatening women with rape. Just as the quality of intergroup relations among the Gusii is reflected in heterosexual relations, one could suggest that the quality of interpersonal relations is reflected in the incidence of rape. In societies where males are trained to be dominant and interpersonal relations are marked by outbreaks of violence, one can predict that females may become the victims in the playing out of the male ideology of power and control.

A broader socio-cultural approach is also found in the work of Wolfgang & Ferracuti (1967) and Amir (1971). Wolfgang & Ferracuti present the concept of the subculture of violence which is formed of those from the lower classes and the disenfranchised. The prime value is the use of physical aggression as a demonstration of masculinity and toughness. In his study of rape, Amir placed the rapist “squarely within the subculture of violence” (Brownmiller 1975, p. 181). Rape statistics in Philadelphia showed that in 43% of the cases examined, rapists operated in pairs or groups. The rapists tended to be in the 15-19 age bracket, the majority were not married, and 90% belonged to the lower socioeconomic class and lived in inner city neighborhoods where there was also a high degree of crime against the person. In addition, 71% of the rapes were planned. In general, the profile presented by Amir is reminiscent of the pattern of rape found among the Kikuyu, where a band of boys belonging to a guild roamed the country side in search of a woman to gang rape as a means of proving their manhood and as a prelude to marriage. Brownmiller summarizes Amir’s study with the following observations:

> Like assault, rape is an act of physical damage to another person, and like robbery it is also an act of acquiring property: the intent is to "have" the female body in the acquisitory meaning of the term. A woman is perceived by the rapist both as hated person and desired property. Hostility against her and possession of her may be simultaneous motivations, and the hatred for her is expressed in the same act that is the attempt to "take" her against her will. In one violent crime, rape is an act against person and property.

The importance of the work of Wolfgang and Ferracuti, Amir, and Brownmiller's observations lies in demonstrating that rape is linked with an overall pattern of violence and that part of this pattern includes the concept of woman as property. From the short descriptions of rape in some of the societies presented above, it is clear rape is likely to occur in what I would call, to borrow from Wolfgang, cultures of violence. Rape prone societies, as noted, are likely to include payment to the wronged husband, indicating that the concept of women as properly also exists. This concept is not new to anthropology. It has been heavily stressed in the work of Levi-Strauss who perceives tribal women as objects in an elaborate exchange system between men.

The second type of approach to the understanding of rape focuses on the socialization process and psychoanalytic variables. This approach is reflected in the following quote from the conclusions of David Abrahamsen who conducted a Rorschach study on the wives of eight convicted rapists in 1954. Abrahamsen (1960, p. 165) says:

> The conclusions reached were that the wives of the sex offenders on the surface behaved toward men in a submissive and masochistic way but latently denied their femininity and showed an aggressive masculine orientation; they unconsciously invited sexual aggression, only to respond to it with coolness and rejection. They stimulated their husbands into attempts to prove themselves, attempts which necessarily ended in frustration and increased their husbands' own doubts about their masculinity. In doing so, the wives unknowingly continued the type of relationship the offender had had with his mother. There can be no doubt that the sexual frustration which the wives caused is one of the factors motivating rape, which might be tentatively described as a displaced attempt to force a seductive but rejecting mother into submission.

Brownmiller (1975, p. 179) includes this quote in her analysis of policeblotter rapists and her reaction to it is rather interesting. She rejects Abrahamsen's conclusions because they place the burden of guilt not on the rapist but on his mother and wife. The fact of the matter is that dominance cannot exist without passivity, as sadism cannot exist without masochism. What makes men sadistic and women masochistic, or men dominant and women passive, must be studied as part of an overall syndrome. Abrahamsea's conclusions certainly apply to Gusii males and females. With respect to the way in which Gusii wives invite sexual aggression from their husbands consider the following description of various aspects of Gusii nuptials:

> … the groom in his finery returns to the bride's family where he is stopped by a crowd of women who deprecate his physical appearance. Once he is in the house of the bride's mother and a sacrifice has been performed by the marriage priest, the women begin again, accusing the groom of impotence on the wedding night and claiming that his penis is too small to be effective. … When the reluctant bride arrives at the groom's house, the matter of first importance is the wedding night sexual performance. … The

> bride is determined to put her new husband's sexual competence to the most severe test possible. She may take magical measures which are believed to result in his failure in intercourse. … The bride usually refuses to get onto the bed; if she did not resist the groom's advances she would be thought sexually promiscuous. At this point some of the young men may forcibly disrobe her and put her on the bed. ... As he proceeds toward sexual intercourse she continues to resist and he must force her into position. Ordinarily she performs the practice known as *ogotega*, allowing him between her thighs but keeping the vaginal muscles so tense that penetration is impossible. … Brides are said to take pride in the length of time they can hold off their mates (LeVine, 1959, pp. 967—969).

The relations between parents and children among the Gusii also fit Abrahamsen's conclusions concerning the etiology of rape. The son has a close and dependent relationship with his mother. The father is aloof from all his children, but especially his daughters. The father's main function is to punish which means that for the Gusii girl, her early connection with men is one of avoidance and fear. On the other hand, the relationship of the Gusii boy with his mother is characterized by dependence and seduction.

Studies of the etiology of rape suggest several hypotheses that can be tested cross-culturally. These hypotheses are not opposed; they are stated at different explanatory levels. One set phrases the explanation in socio-cultural terms, the other in psycho-cultural terms. Still another, only touched on above, suggests that male sexuality is inherently explosive unless it achieves heterosexual outlet. This latter assumption, implicit in LeVine's hypotheses mentioned above, also draws on the notion, most recently expressed in the work of Stoller (1979), that sexual excitement is generated by the desire, overt or hidden, to harm another. If the latter were the case, we would be led to believe that rape would exist in all societies. The argument presented here, however, suggests that rape is an enactment not of human nature, but of socio-cultural forces. Thus, the prevalence of rape should be associated with the expressions of these forces. Some of these expressions and their correlation with the incidence of rape are examined in the next section.

Socio-Cultural Correlates of Rape

Four general hypotheses are suggested by the work of LeVine, Brownmiller, Abrahamsen, Wolfgang and Amir. These hypotheses are:

1. Sexual repression is related to the incidence of rape;
2. intergroup and interpersonal violence is enacted in male sexual violence;
3. the character of parent-child relations is enacted in male sexual violence;
4. rape is an expression of a social ideology of male dominance.

These hypotheses were tested by collecting data on: variables relating to childrearing; behavior indicating sexual repression; interpersonal and intergroup violence; sexual separation; glorification of the male role and an undervaluation of the female role.

The relevant variables are listed in Table 3 along with the correlation of each with the incidence of rape (see Table 4 for variable codes). The correlations presented in Table 3 support all but the first of the general hypotheses listed above. There is no significant correlation between variables measuring sexual repression and the incidence of rape. Admittedly, however, sexual

repression is very difficult to measure. The variables presented in Table 3 may not, in fact, be related to sexual abstinence. The variables are: length of the post-partum sex taboo (a variable which indicates how long the mother abstains from sexual intercourse after the birth of a child); attitude toward (a variable which ranges between the disapproval and approval of premarital sex); age at marriage for males; and the number of taboos reflecting male avoidance of female sexuality.

TABLE 3
CORRELATES OF RAPE

Variables Related to Sexual Repression[a]	**Correlation with Incidence of Rape** (RA4)[b]
1. Length of the post-partum sex taboo (Inf 10)	NS
2. Attitude toward pre-marital sex (Psex)	NS
3. Age al marriage for males (Agem)	NS
4. No. of taboos reflecting male avoidance of female sexuality (All)	NS
Variables Related to intergroup and Interpersonal Violence	
5. Raiding other groups for wives (Wie)	r = -.29 (N = 83, p = .004)
6. Degree of Interpersonal violence (Viol)	r = .47 (N = 90, p = .000)
7. Ideology of Male Toughness (Macho)	r = -.42 (N = 73, p = .000)
8. War	r = .21 (N = 86, p = .03)
Variables Related Childrearing	
9. Character of father-daughter relationships (Fada)	r = -.20 (N = 65, p = .06)
10. Proximity of father in care of infants (Inf 23)	r = -.16 (N = 83, p = .08)
11. Character of mother-son relationships (Moso)	NS
Variables Related to Ideology of Male Dominance	
12. Female power and authority (Stat)	r = -.22 (N = 83, p = .03)
13. Female political decision making (H05)	r = -.33 (N = 88, p = .00)
14. Attitude toward women as citizens (H08)	r = -.28 (N = 84, p = .005)
15. Presence of special places for men (Mho)	r = -.26 (N = 71, p = .01)
16. Presence of special places for women (Fho)	r = -.17 (N = 70, p = .08)

[a] Codes for variables are presented in Table 4.
[b] Code presented in Table 2. Correlation coefficient is Pearson r.

The correlations presented in Table 3 support the hypothesis that intergroup and interpersonal violence is enacted in sexual violence against females. Raiding other groups for wives is significantly associated with the incidence of rape. The intensity of interpersonal violence in a society is also positively correlated with the incidence of rape, as is the presence of an ideology which encourages men to be tough and aggressive. Finally, when warfare is reported as being frequent or endemic (as opposed to absent or occasional) rape is more likely to be present.

The character of relations between parents and children is not strongly associated with the incidence of rape. When the character of the father-daughter relationship is primarily indifferent, aloof, cold and stern, rape is more likely to be present. The same is true when fathers are distant from the care of infants. However, there is no relationship between the nature of the mother-son tie (as measured in this study) and the incidence of rape.

TABLE 4
VARIABLE CODES FOR CORRELATIONS LISTED IN TABLE 3

1. Inf 10:1 = intercourse after birth — 7 = intercourse after more than 2 yrs.
2. Psex: 1 = premarital sex expected — 9 = 6 strongly disapproved.
3. Agem: 1 = men marry around puberty — 3 = 25 yrs. or older.
4. All: 0 = no taboos reflecting male avoidance of intercourse — 3 = 3 taboos.
5. Wie: 1 = Wives taken from hostile groups — 2 = practice absent.
6. Viol: 1 = interpersonal violence mild or absent — 3 = strong.
7. Macho: 1 = ideology of male toughness present — 2 = absent.
8. War: 1 = war reported or absent or occasional — 2 = frequent or endemic.
9. Fada: 1 = fathers affectionate with daughters — 2 = aloof, cold.
10. Inf 23: 1 = no close proximity between fathers and infants — 5 = regular, close proximity.
11. Moso: 1 = mothers affectionate with sons — 2 = aloof, cold.
12. Stat: 1 = no female political or economic power — 6 = females have political and economic power. *
13. H05: 0 = females have no influence – public decision making — 1 = females have influence.
14. H08: 1 = males express contempt for women or citizens — 4 = women are respected as citizens.
15. Mho: places where males congregate alone are present — 2 = absent.
16. Fho:1 = places where females congregate alone are present —2 = absent.

*This variable forms a Guttman Scale. See Sanday, (1981) for scale properties.

There is considerable evidence supporting the notion that rape is an expression of a social ideology of male dominance. Female power and authority is lower in rape prone societies. Women do not participate in public decision making in these societies and males express contempt for women as decision makers. In addition, there is greater sexual separation in rape prone societies as indicated by the presence of structures or places where the sexes congregate in single sex groups.

The correlates of rape presented in Table 3 strongly suggest that rape is the playing out of a socio-cultural script in which the expression of personhood for males is directed by, among other things, interpersonal violence and an ideology of toughness. If we see the sexual act as the ultimate emotional expression of the self, then it comes as no surprise that male sexuality is phrased in physically aggressive terms when other expressions of self are phrased in these terms. This explanation does not rule out the importance of the relationship between parents and children, husbands and wives. Raising a violent son requires certain behavior patterns in parents, behaviors that husbands may subsequently act out as adult males. Sexual repression does not explain the correlations presented in Table 3. Rape is not an instinct triggered by celibacy, enforced for whatever reason. Contrary to what some social scientists assume, men are not animals whose sexual behavior is programmed by instinct. Men are human beings whose sexuality is biologically based and culturally encoded.

Conclusion

Rape in tribal societies is part of a cultural configuration that includes interpersonal violence, male dominance, and sexual separation. In such societies, as the Murphys (1974, p. 197) say about the Mundurucu: “men … use the penis to dominate their women.” The question remains as to what motivates the rape prone cultural configuration. Considerable evidence (see Sanday, 1981) suggests that this configuration evolves in societies faced with depleting food resources, migration, or other factors contributing to a dependence on male destructive capacities as opposed to female fertility.

In tribal societies women are often equated with fertility and growth, men with aggression and destruction. More often than not, the characteristics associated with maleness and femaleness are equally valued. When people perceive an imbalance between the food supply and population needs, or when populations are in competition for diminishing resources, the male role is accorded greater prestige. Females are perceived as objects to be controlled as men struggle to retain or to gain control of their environment. Behaviors and attitudes prevail that separate the sexes and force men into a posture of proving their manhood. Sexual violence is one of the ways in which men remind themselves that they are superior. As such, rape is part of a broader struggle for control in the face of difficult circumstances. Where men are in harmony with their environment, rape is usually absent.

The insights garnered from the cross-cultural study of rape in tribal societies bear on the understanding and treatment of rape in our own. Ours is a heterogeneous society in which more men than we like to think feel that they do not have mastery over their destiny and who learn from the script provided by nightly television that violence is a way of achieving the material all Americans expect. It is important to understand that violence is socially and not biologically programmed. Rape is not an integral part of male nature, but the means by which men programmed for violence express their sexual selves. Men who are conditioned to respect the female virtues of growth and the sacredness of life, do not violate women. It is significant that in societies where nature is held sacred, rape occurs only rarely. The incidence of rape in our society will be reduced to the extent that boys grow to respect women and the qualities so often associated with femaleness in other societies - namely, nurturance, growth, and nature. Women can contribute to the socialization of boys by making these respected qualities in their struggle for equal rights.

REFERENCES

Abrahamsen, D. *The psychology of crime*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Amir, M. *Patterns in forcible rape.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press; 1971.

Ardrey, R. *The territorial imperative*. New York: Dell, 1966.

Blanguernon, C. *Le hogger (The hogger).* Paris: B. Arthaud, 1955 (Translated form the French for the Human Relations Area Files by Thomas Turner).

Broude, G. J. & Greene, S. J. Cross-cultural codes on twenty sexual attitudes and practices. *Ethnology,* 1976, 15(4), 409-430.

Brownmiiler, S. *Against our will.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.

Dorsey, J. O. *Omaha sociology*. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology, Third Annual Report, 1881-82, pp. 205-370. Washington, D.C.: U.S.' Government Printing Office, 1884.

Elwin, V. *The muria and their ghotul*. Bombay: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1947.

Erdland, P. A. *Die Marshall-insulaner* (The Marshall islanders). Munster.' Anthropos Bibliothek Ethnological Monographs 1914, 2(1). (Trans)ated by Richard Neuse for Human Relations Area Files).
Evans-Pritchard, E. E. *The Azande*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971,
Hallowell, A. I. *Culture and experiience*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.
Harris, M. *Cannibals and kings*. New York: Vintage/Random House, 1977.
Hoebel, E. A. *The Cheyennes*. New York; Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960,
Lagae, C. R. Les Azande ou Niam-Niarn. *Bibliotheque - Congo* (Vol. IS). Brussels: Vromant & Co., 1926. (Translated for Human Relations Area Files), New Haven, CT: HRAF.
Lambert, H. E. *Kikuyu social and political institutions.* London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
LeVine R, A. Gusii sex offenses: A study in social control. *American Anthropologist*, 1959, 61, 965-990.
Lorenz, K. *On aggression*. London: Methuen, 1966.
Maiskii, I. *Sovremennaia Mongolia (Contemporary Mongolia).* Irkutsk: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, Irkutskoe Otedelenie, 1921. (Translated from the Russian for *Human Relations Area Files* by Mrs. Dayton and J. Kunitz).
Malinowski, B. *The sexual life of savages in north-western Melanesia*. London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1929.
Maybury-Lewis, D. *Akwe - Shavante society*. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1967.
Mead, M. *The changing culture of an Indian tribe.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.
Murdock, G. P. White, D. R. Standard cross-cultural sample. *Ethnology*. 1969, 329469.
Murphy Y. Murphy, R. *Women of the forest.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
Rattray, R. S. *Ashanti*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
Rattray. R. S. *Religion and art in Ashanti.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.
Sanday P. R. *Female power and male dominance: On the origins of sexual inequality.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
Spencer, Baldwin, & Gillen F. J. *The Arunta* (2 Vols.). London: Macmillan & co., 1927.
Stoller, R. J. *Sexual excitement.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.
Stout, D. B. *San Blas Cura acculturation*. New York: Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, 1947, 9.
Tiger, L. *Men in groups*. New York: Random House, 1969.
Turnball, C. *Wayward servants.* New York: Natural History Press, 1965.
Wolfgang, M. E. & Ferracuti, F. *The subculture of violence*. London: Tavistock. 1967.

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 47 - 88 (+ appendix)

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

From Matrilineal Kinship to Matriculture: Establishing a Canadian Agenda

Workshop Report

Workshop hosted by the InterCulture research group, University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Canada, 25-28 April 2017

Report by Linnéa Rowlatt
October 2019

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture. This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Table of Contents 48
   Acknowledgements 49
   Citation 49

2. Summary 50
   Workshop Participants 50

3. Original Goals and Aims of the Workshop 51

4. The Workshop: Daily Proceedings 51
   a) Day One - Tuesday, 25 April 2017: Matrilineal societies and matriculture 52
      Welcome to Algonquin Anishnaabeg territory 52
      Introduction and short history of the project 52
      Welcome to matricentric thinking – Georges Sioui 53
      Introducing matrilineal kinship systems 53
      Introducing Matriculture 55
      Working on Matriculture in Canada / North America: A linguistic survey 56
      Conclusions and reflections on Day One by the organizers 59

   b) Day Two - Wednesday, 26 April 2017: Matriculture and women's issues 59
      Smudging ritual 59
      Keynote Address: Matriculture in action – Peggy Reeves Sanday 60
      Where are the matrilineal societies in North America? 62
      We Are In Her and She Is In Us: rematriation through performance of the Haudenosaunee Sky Woman narrative 63
      Over the Generations, They Have Done Everything: Indigenous Women and Matrilineality (NWAC) 64
      Conclusion and reflections on Day Two by the organizers 67

   c) Day Three - Thursday, 27 April 2017: Toward a common agenda 68
      Prayer Circle 68
      Review of Days One and Two 68
         A- The challenges for academics 69
            A - 1. Working with Indigenous Organizations 70
            A - 2 Working with interested communities and individuals 70
            A - 3 The challenge for academics in Indigenous contexts 70
         B- Challenges within Indigenous communities themselves: What Indigenous women are facing 71
      Where research could take us - Research topics and applied research 75
      Conclusion and reflections on Day Three by the organizers 76

(*con't*)

d) Day Four - Friday, 28 April 2017 77
Prayer Circle 77
Morning Session – Catherine Martin 77
Responses to NWAC's questions from Day 2 79
Question One: What use is matrilineality today for Indigenous people in Canada at Community Level? 80
Policy Level 80
Societal Level 80
Question 2: How can the concept of matriculture help Canadian Indigenous women now? 81
Features of a strong matriculture, articulated collectively by participants 83

5. Concluding Remarks on the Workshop 84

6. References 86

7. Appendix A (independently paginated) 88

Acknowledgements
InterCulture research group would like to gratefully acknowledge the support of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ottawa, the Research and Publications Committee of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ottawa, and the Native Women's Association of Canada, without all of whom this workshop would not have taken place.

The author would like to laud the intellectual achievements of Dr. Marie-Françoise Guédon, her contributions to anthropology, and to matricultures around the world. Her insights and tireless leadership have been essential to developing this new field of inquiry and she is consistently advancing knowledge about matriculture. In particular, the author would like to express gratitude to Dr. Guédon for her supervision of the writing-up phase of this workshop.

The organizers of the workshop (Marie-Françoise Guédon, Angela Sumegi, Cheryl Gaver, and Linnéa Rowlatt) gratefully acknowledge all the participants of the workshop, many of whom gave their time, resources, and energy to attend. We are honoured by the trust given to us and recognize the courage and tact that participation (occasionally) required. Thank you.

Citation
Linnéa Rowlatt, 'Report on *From Matrilineal Kinship to Matriculture: Establishing a Canadian Agenda*', workshop at University of Ottawa 25–28 April 2017, *Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies* 1:I (May 2020), URL: https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix/1.

SUMMARY

The InterCulture research group's workshop entitled *From Matrilineal Kinship to Matriculture: Establishing a Canadian Agenda* was held in Ottawa, Canada, from the 25th to the 28th of April 2017. Its main goal was to establish a research agenda for a project initiated by our research team, InterCulture (located in the University of Ottawa), devoted to an examination of the situation of matrilineal societies in the world and a critical review of the scholarly study of matrilineal systems. We wanted to centralize and prioritize questions and issues coming from Canadian Indigenous communities, and to set the foundations for future collaborative projects. At the same time, as the workshop title implies, another goal was to test the viability of the new concept of matriculture. We pursued these goals by gathering members of Canadian Indigenous matrilineal societies, representatives of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) and of the Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC), and academics from several disciplines and institutions.

The workshop was successful on many levels. We learned that the concept of matriculture is a relevant and even essential tool for understanding some eastern Canadian Indigenous cultures, that the presence and implications of the idea are confirmed in language, myth, and pre-colonial social structures among the Mikm'aq, Wendaki, Haudenosanee, and Algonquin peoples, and that matriculturality has been largely ignored by settler governments, social services, and other settler interventions in Indigenous societies, to the detriment of these communities. Workshop participants identified several markers or identifying features of matriculture.

Workshop organizers were challenged to identify the value of the concept for Indigenous women today. Our initial response highlighted the policy and social implications of identifying the pre-colonial status of women in matricultural Indigenous societies. These implications include increased security and well-being for women and, for men, an absence of the need to assert their status and worth through violence.

Some areas for future research were identified, including culturally-specific models of puberty and womanhood, correlations between matriculture and birth-giving practices and outcomes, potential links between matriculture and acceptance of non-binary sexuality, and even pre-colonial Indigenous inheritance patterns. An important element for a surviving matriculture is linguistic continuity through the colonization period, leading to our inclusion of linguistic similarities and variations among matricultures as a primary area for future research. Identifying matricultural features which have endured through colonization may play a central role in strengthening Indigenous matricultures facing contemporary challenges.

Workshop Participants

The following twenty-one people participated in all or some days of the workshop: Idoia Arana-Beobide, Jane Ann Chartrand, Cheryl Gaver, Marie-Françoise Guédon, Kahente Horn-Miller, Rebecca Johnston, Margaret Kress, Middlé Lemoine, Alex Maass, Hope MacLean, Catherine Martin, Miigam'agan, La Mingying, Melissa Otis, Evie Plaice, Leah Quinlan, Linnéa Rowlatt, Peggy Reeves Sanday, Georges Sioui, Angela Sumegi, Kim Wakeford. Only those

making presentations are identified by name in the daily proceedings.

ORIGINAL GOALS AND AIMS OF THE WORKSHOP

Building on the lived experiences of the participants, the group aimed first to devise a framework to gather and share information on matrilineal societies in the world and specifically in Canada, their cultural contexts and their contemporary situations, and then to identify primary and urgent issues and questions that would have to find their place in a shared research agenda.

Original Goals, as formulated by the organizers:
a) **A research agenda:** In order to establish a research agenda for our Canadian partners and ourselves, it is necessary to engage with questions emerging from our colleagues and from the Indigenous communities while supporting their experience and explorations. Research must adapt to the needs and values of the communities, and it must address the theoretical and methodological foundations of our collaborative effort.

b) **Test the relevance of the new concept of matriculture:** Since the concept of matriculture is becoming a cornerstone of our program, we have to test its relevance and seek questions and critiques emerging from Indigenous communities and institution engaged in programs that may benefit from this new perspective. Most programs and projects aiming to better the situation of women are engaged at the social or economic levels; few if any, target the cultural dimension.

c) **Further collaborative projects:** Several projects are already being prepared by InterCulture and its collaborators in partnership with communities and researchers in Congo, in China, and in Alaska. In Canada, several related programs and projects are initiated by the Indigenous communities themselves. We have noticed that people involved in these initiatives work in relative isolation and with little resource. Within the next few years, we look forward to establishing a formal collaborative network to support and communicate research programs and results among all participants and between their communities of origin or of work.

THE WORKSHOP: DAILY PROCEEDINGS

Includes schedules and titles of presentations, summaries and discussions; the following excerpts highlight some of the discussions that took place during the event.

Please note: This is not a direct transcript of the conversation during our four days together, as the conversations were not recorded mechanically or digitally. Instead, this is a compilation of the notes taken by Cheryl Gaver, Melissa Otis, and myself. With these notes, I have done my best to bring spoken conversation into the printed realm. To do that, sometimes exact wording was missed or I gathered comments together thematically and out of chronological order. Rather than providing a verbatim transcript, my goal is that readers will be able to follow the growth of ideas and perspectives during the workshop. Linnéa Rowlatt

a) Day One - Tuesday, 25 April 2017: Matrilineal societies and matriculture

Welcome to Algonquin Anishnaabeg territory

The workshop opened with a ceremonial welcome to Algonquin Anishnaabeg territory from an Anishnaabe-kwe elder.

Introduction and short history of the project

presentation by Marie-Françoise Guédon, Director of InterCulture

This project began with InterCulture's 2006 visit of several Canadian scholars to the University of Yunnan, in Kunming, China, which led to meeting several Chinese Ethnic Minority communities over the following years. Eventually, the Git'ksan people (a matrilineal Indigenous society from British Colombia) were invited to visit Sichuan and Yunnan Provinces, and to meet people from the matrilineal Mosuo villages at Lugu Lake. There, as the two groups danced with each other and spoke to each other, they realized they had much in common and shared many similar issues. When we returned to Canada, groups from the Tsimshian, Tlingit and other matrilineal Indigenous people in North America became involved; workshops were held in Ottawa to explore what was going on in matrilineal studies and how various societies originally identified as matrilineal were faring today, and what, if anything was needed to happen first to bring some recognition to the Mosuo people, and then to support other matrilineal societies in the world.

An assumption we often encounter is that matrilineal societies are a thing of the past, and that, in any case, they do not matter anymore, if they ever did. But matrilineal societies still exist, composing about 7% of the societies in the world, a small but vigorous minority, most if not all of them being Indigenous people. North America has more matrilineal societies than the other continents. We took on as part of our task, then, to publicize the fact of the existence of these societies, and their importance, both as cultural legacy and as teaching partners.

The first point to come out of these earlier workshops was the recognition that matrilineality is very diverse in its manifestations. Another point raised was the displacement of kinship as a central focus of anthropological study, and the subsequent disappearance of matrilineality as a key feature of social organization studies. But it appeared that for the communities we met, matrilineality was not merely a feature of kinship but indeed a crucial element of their worldview. We soon came to agree with Nicole-Claude Mathieu that the whole field needed a critical revision of it's basic assumptions and definitions. Another recurrent point concerned the misalignment and sometimes heated debate between the advocates of the term matriarchy, and the proponents of the term matrilineality. This debate is two centuries old and often centers on undefined and unexamined notions. (Other "*matri*-terms" are being developed to explore what the terms really have to say about cultural encounters between different societies, and the basic assumptions that these terms are hiding. The field turns out to be vastly richer than we had first conceived.) We then introduced the new concept of matriculture to address our growing concern with the cultural context in which matrilineal kin groups or similar structures develop.

Together with colleagues and students, we set out to seek, then meet, scholars and Indigenous representatives of matrilineal societies to construct a new vision of that field. With this workshop, we are focusing on Indigenous North America.

Welcome to matricentric thinking
comments by Dr Georges Sioui
The first speaker was Dr. Georges Sioui, from the Petite Lorette or Wendaki (Huron) community. He quoted at length from his upcoming monograph, *Eatononha: Native Roots of Modern Democracy*. He spoke about *matricentrism* and the rightful place of women at the center of communities, *geogynophobia* (the fear of women and of the earth exhibited by many men), and the need for environmental justice and feminine justice as a way for humans to survive with the earth.

> "In a world vastly patriarchal, men have invented means, mostly through the use of force, to substitute themselves as the central place in society. This is the seed of disorder which affects our order. We as a global society must develop the ideological and spiritual means to allow women to occupy the place at the middle, which will allow us to keep imagining and constructing our future as a species."
>
> - Dr. Georges Sioui

Introducing matrilineal kinship systems
presentation by Marie-Françoise Guédon
The first session began with a brief review of matrilineal kinship, where one's social identity is acquired through the mother; a person belongs to one's mother's lineage or clan, that is a unilineal descent group. A lineage can form either through the mother, or though the father, forming social entities with clear boundaries. Bilateral ties, i.e. through both the mother's side and the father's side result in a very large set of people, called a "kindred", the composition of which is fluid, varies from one person to the next, has no definite boundary and overlaps with others. By contrast, lineages (with a known ancestor) and clans (with a remote assumed common ancestry) can form corporate entities. Technically speaking, a matrilineal system cannot survive without some form of exogamy, that is without people marrying outside their clan or lineage.

Matrilineal societies are not the norm, but they are not that rare either. Out of six or seven hundred societies with unilineal kin groups, we can still identify at least eighty matrilineal societies. We cannot really measure their prevalence, since we are still uncertain about their actual number; this is due in part to the fact that throughout the world, the field is still anchored in unexamined views inherited from nineteenth century theoretical literature on matrilineal / matriarchal societies. Furthermore, criteria defining matrilineal societies are too narrow and too vague for an adequate inventory of the societies in question. We must also realize that state societies and their administrative bodies are at best not interested in matrilineal systems, at worst openly hostile to them, and in any case, do not often recognize or even mention matrilineal systems even when they are present.

When we move beyond a strict definition of matrilineality to include, for instance, matrilocality (the young couple resides with or near the parents of the bride) or uxorilocality (the new husband moves into his wife's home), many others cases emerge. When speaking about matrilineal societies, we are not necessarily speaking of a clear opposition between either matrilineal or patrilineal systems – but rather of a continuum with variations along the way, which means that further studies are needed in many cases. Finally, scholars working with these societies are rare and often work in isolation; it seems that present state institutions, including NGOs, are reluctant to acknowledge the persistence of matrilineal societies to this day.

A matrilineal society organizes genders around its descent and filiation systems. The special role of the maternal uncle is emphasized, often as the male head of the family while the mother, or mother's mother, usually wields a definite authority, depending on the system, or becomes herself the head of the family. Sometimes, the sister and the brother (children of a common mother), rather than the couple formed by husband and wife, become the primary reference for the family or lineage.

Does this matter as far as women's lives are concerned? As we shall see, matrilineal societies share certain kinship features that facilitate the social visibility of women and the recognition of their social responsibility. The marital bond accommodates the role of the mother's side of the family and defines itself more as a partnership, providing much greater mobility for the wives who retain throughout their lives their identity as daughters of their clan. The expected presence of active female figures in the community finds echoes in the local literature, and even in the mythology. Despite the presence of these features, though, the presence of matrilineal kin groups does not mean that men cannot be in charge nor does it mean that the societies in question are necessarily all at peace with their neighbors. On the average, though, it is clear that women and children are better off under the matrilineal system (see Peggy Reeves Sanday's comparative studies). For women, we have found that one disadvantage of patriarchal societies is that girls marry young and move to the husband's home, due to which the transmission of culture from mother (and mother's family) to daughter and girls in general is much weakened; women have to re-start their cultural tradition again and again in every generation with the often reluctant help of their in-laws (see Germaine Tillion, *Le harem et les cousins*) whereas men continue to build on their own local tradition. We have also begun to notice that generally speaking, matrilineal societies offer much more mobility to girls and women, both socially and geographically.

We owe these new perspectives to scholars such as Annette Wiener, Nicole-Claude Mathieu, and Peggy Reeves Sanday, who are among the best-known researchers.[1] Looking at the new data and the new ideas these anthropologists and others have generated, data that emphasizes the links between matrilineal kinship systems and patterns of governance, cosmogony, mythology, ritual life and other features of "intellectual culture", we now propose a shift from a *matrilineal* perspective to a *matricultural* perspective, so as to enlarge the debate to those

1We would also like to mention the essential contribution to the field by scholars such as Heide Göttner-Abendroth and Kaarina Kailo, whose work has been focused on matriarchal studies.

aspects of culture that allow the idea and the practice of matrilineal kinship to flourish.

Discussion:
Indigenous peoples have kinship systems and kinship terminologies that differ from the European systems; for instance, they do not use 1st / 2nd / 3rd cousins; relationships (kin connections) are different. There are also different ways of looking at conception. For the Mi'kmaq, it is clear that men don't have children, only women do. They say a human is an image from the divine in human form and the language captures this concept. We gave some time to comparing Iroquois and Basque creation stories.

When acknowledging that examples of matricultures are still around and are still part of the life of many communities in North America, we must challenge academics to deal with them properly, which is to say, by listening to the people themselves and going back to the original sources. The available data is often contradictory; too many assumptions are baseless. Having also noticed also that Indigenous societies themselves as well as the official administrators use the (early) anthropological vocabulary to describe – and define - clans, lineages, matrilines, matriarchy, and kinship systems, among other terms, it is urgent to review at least the vocabulary and its implications. In a context with many erroneous assumptions about matricultures, the gaps in our knowledge of the situation today in North America and globally are obvious.

Lunch

Introducing Matriculture
Group Discussion
The conceptual shift from matrilineal kinship to matriculture changes the focus of debate, especially when we address issues of power, issues of gender, so-called "women's issues", and how those are defined and wielded within a society. Matrilineal kinship and matrilineages become expressions of matriculturality, rather than isolated traits having a limited impact on the role of women in the society.

A question about *matrifocality* was brought forward, where the women are heading the families, working and holding the communities together while the men are itinerant as in Haiti, for instance. This situation was then compared to India, where the society is very patriarchal, but if you want to make anything happen in a particular village, the men will say "ask the women". Could something similar be happening with Indigenous people in urban areas? A participant felt this situation was not matrifocality, which entails women as the sole culture-bearers and transmitters because men are absent. Matrifocal systems are produced by circumstances that keep men away, while matrilineality is built into the social structures through matrilines into which men are very much present and active participants. We need good definitions of specific concepts to build an adequate terminology. A participant pointed out that this is a major challenge, as we have real-life situations but the terminology available to describe them may carry hidden assumptions.

There was an observation that cultures are living and changing outside of academia, regardless of scholarly views, which raises new issues. For example, what does it mean to be matrilineal when Indigenous women live in patriarchal urban societies, without their grandparents or uncles? A participant responded with an example of how scholars contribute to shaping real-life situations, for example, that of black families in the South (USA). Sociologist Carol Stack wrote about these societies, describing them as *matrifocal*. The term caught on and turned the public's eye away from seeing them as "poor blacks", etc., to recognize that something else was going on. She suggested a need to recognize that anthropologists and anthropological theories can have a powerful impact on the world. Anthropologists are not limited to academia but contribute a useful awareness when they notice something and bring it to the public's attention. (*Note: Sanday's own introduction of the concept of 'rape culture' to public discourse is a good example of such an intervention*).

A participant talked about competing worldviews coming from the Whites and from the Indigenous society, where, for example, in terms of urbanization, the move to urban areas may be seen by white social workers as a severing of ties with their community while Indigenous women may see it as moving around their own territory and their own (non-localized) community. The reservation is not their longhouse and there can be family members in the city to help someone navigate the city. There may also be competition between different Indigenous worldviews: she mentioned that the Mi'kmaq refer to a feminine earth. A participant introduced the non-gendered suggestion of 'parent earth', used by some Athapaskan-speaking peoples. Also data interpretation differs from people to people, especially when job-related, and we need to keep agency in mind – as in the story of the hospital that the visiting doctors thought *they* 'owned', in contrast with local female nurses who felt they 'owned' the hospital while the doctors were only visitors.

A participant noted that although the Basques remain independent and strong-spirited, traditional culture has eroded under the pressures of modern life. Anthropology and anthropological terms bring a way to communicate about the past and at least introduce some awareness that Basque connection to both the larger community and the ancestors is being lost. Anthropologist therefore have a duty to clean up their terminology, since the terms we use always relate to certain value systems and to an ideology that may not be in keeping with what they are intended to depict

These questions remind us that all matrilineal societies have to contend with profound differences between their own culture and that of their neighbors and of the state.

Break

Working on Matriculture in Canada / North America: A linguistic survey
presentation by Marie-Françoise Guédon
Language is a fundamental expression of culture; could it carry basic principles supporting our understanding of society? What would happen if we found that language is an important support for matrilineality and matricultures (as is kinship terminology for kinship systems)?

Marie-Françoise juxtaposed maps showing North American linguistic families on the one hand, and on the other, matrilineal societies, demonstrating a high correlation between them. That is, matrilineality is present in some language families, such as the Athapaskan, Iroquoian, Caddoan, and Algonquian languages, but not in others, including the Eskimoan-Aleutian, Uto-Aztecan, Yuman-Hokan, Penutian, or Wakashan language families (which are almost never matrilineal). Location and geography are important in terms of the relationship between dialects, but language is one of the most enduring components of culture, unless attacked directly by a dominant society with enforced schooling in the dominant language, or a strong class difference between rich speakers of the dominant and colonizing language and poor speakers of the Indigenous language. This simple preliminary survey seems to indicate, therefore, that the location of matrilineal societies in North America may well be related to the geographical distribution of language families.

Early anthropologists thought one could explain matrilineality by the fact that men were away so much that women had to replace them, but this old theory does not explain the patrilineal or bilateral societies which kept their old social system in the same situation. The way of life does not seem to matter, whether societies are more horticulturally inclined, or living by hunting or fishing; some matrilineal societies are hierarchical, other non-hierarchical; some are peaceful, other are more warlike. Even the type of governance does not seem to matter, as some matrilineal societies had women chiefs, some did not, among others women chose the male chiefs. The only variable that seems to fit is the linguistic one.

If the distribution of matrilineality matches that of linguistic families, then worldview, or something expressed through language, is deeply involved in the development and maintenance of matrilineality The way we think, the way we speak, our values, may shape how we organize our societies.

Group Discussion:
We started this research on language using the expression “matrilineal systems”, rather than “matricultures” because the currently available data, dating back half a century and more, deals mostly directly with kinship and unilineal kin groups, usually identified either as patrilineal or matrilineal. *But a matrilineal system presupposes a matriculture that supports it.*

It was noted that matrilineal organization as currently defined implies lineages or equivalent kin groups. There are not countless ways of developing lineages: one aligns oneself either though the father, or through the mother. However, we have found variations on the theme: switching direction every generation, or matrilineal for girls, patrilineal for boys, or even selecting one’s lineage identity at puberty for instance. Our models will have to be refined.

Question: is it always a situation of either/or, or is there a continuum among descent systems with nuances, where border communities among language groups may start showing traces of both? In other words, is there evidence of cross-cultural influence? Marie-Françoise pointed out that, in fact, there is a large array of possibilities for such influence. There are some instances of

borrowing in border communities (as among the Haisla, northern Wakashan, who have borrowed the matrilineal clan system of their Tsimshian neighbors. Possibly, also, the Algonquian-speaking Blackfoot and their relatives in contact with the patrilineal clans of their southern neighbours, but we do not know how frequently those cases of borrowing occur. The kinship systems seem most amenable to change when the original language is replaced by a new one; research is needed here too. Marie-Françoise mentioned that her supervisor, Frederica de Laguna, talked about 'culture words' which cannot be understood outside of their cultural context. When they are translated or replaced with words from the dominant culture, the new words erase important cultural features.

Speaking of matriculture: we are just beginning to search for, recognize or identify cultural traits that are indicative of a strong matriculture, besides matrilineal kin groups. Is it a fact or a coincidence that many matrilineal societies (including Algonquian speakers) make no distinction in their languages between 'he' and 'she'? This is a fact, but we have not looked at the distribution of that trait in a way that correlates it with matrilineality.

A participant introduced the Mi'kmaq view of the Creator as a mother and the father as her helpmate, and suggested that the way one thinks about the world is related to the way one thinks about women.

A series of questions and comments explored the topic of the origin of patrilineality and matrilineality. One question inquired about the reasons why the Inuit developed the way they did, into a patriarchal or patriarchal-like society – their kinship system is actually bilateral, they do not have lineages or clans – (and a dualistic worldview). A related question asked whether patriarchies are always dualistic or binary. A question arose about a potential link between the various matrilineal societies around the world in the same way that one could suppose that monotheistic religions have some conceptual unity, although we have not seen new suggestions of that unity since the 19th century.

What about gender roles? Could a culture that accepts more than two genders fit with our habit of opposing matrilineal and patrilineal systems? Culturally, humans also merge gender with procreation. No matter how we define genders, we are born from a mother, and most of the time, we have a recognized intervention/participation of a father. Some societies may ignore the father… But none can ignore the mother, though many patriarchal systems do away with the mother's presence by defining her as simply a vessel for the seed of the male progenitor, as done by Classical Roman culture.

And gender-related distribution of power? Again, participants collectively do not know enough at this time to answer those points. These questions about the origins of matrilineality lead us into those fundamental ideological choices or assertions, made more than a century ago, at the beginning of this field of research, assertions that may have been left unquestioned or become articles of faith. If we maintain, for instance, that human societies are all originally patriarchal, then the struggle for the formal recognition of women's rights starts with the recognition of women's universal plight. If we begin with the idea of an original and/or mythical matriarchate

evolving world-wide by changing to male dominance, we leave little room for exploring the cultural dimensions. But there are alternatives to this opposition. We may also have to reconsider our notions of domesticity as powerless (see Nicole-Claude Mathieu, *Une maison sans fille est une maison morte.)*

Other topics of research were suggested: could we say that where men are the hunters, they have knowledge of animals as game, whereas women have knowledge of animals as partners? Is the expression "Man the Hunter", which was once so popular, still valid? Recent research has shown that among North American hunter-gatherers (such as the Cree and the Northern Dene) and contrary to the dominant assumptions, women are often very involved in hunting.

Another question: Is there a shamanic dimension to matrilineality, a question considered most important by Nicole-Claude Mathieu?

Conclusions and reflections on Day One (25 April 2017) by the organizers
Many themes emerged from the discussions in response to the presentations, such as the many links between matricentric social organization and the cultural context as a whole, as well as the need to enlarge the discussion. They all confirmed the usefulness of the matriculture concept as a working tool.

Comment and reflection by the organizers:
We have several times today been challenged by the confluence between the understanding of matrilineality and that of matriarchy, a confluence we feel we will have to address. We are also held in check by a tendency to see matrilineality and matriculture as a female feature of culture, rather than a cultural system in which everyone is involved regardless of gender. In retrospect and since we, the organizers, had surveyed beforehand the growing use of the term 'matriarchy' to describe the locus of difference between European and Indigenous societies, we should have anticipated the rapid move in our discussions from matriculture to matriarchate, on the one hand, and to women's issues on the other hand. 'Matriculture' is an abstract term, as is 'culture', and does not present the same concrete rules as, for instance, inheritance from the mother's side, or the authority of the mother's brother and, therefore, may not be obvious to those from outside the field of study.

We also have to recognize that early research data on North American Indigenous societies assumed a similar conjunction between the presence of matrilineal kin groups and the political power attributed to women (women as chiefs, sachems, or warriors), without that link having been critically documented and examined.

b) Day Two - Wednesday, 26 April: Matriculture and women's issues

Smudging ritual
An Algonquin Anishnaabe-kwe Elder offered individual smudging as people entered. Then we formed a circle for our opening prayers.

Keynote Address: Matriculture in action
presentation by Peggy Reeves Sanday (U Penn)
Peggy began her talk by sharing a bit about her schooling in a convent with nuns. It was not always a good experience, but they inspired her to know more about the world. When she arrived at university, she wanted to work with a matriarchy. The choices were the Ashanti in Ghana and the Minangkabau in Sumatra; she chose the Minangkabau and did fieldwork with them from 1981 to 2007, off and on.

Minangkabau ('Glorious Buffalo') cultural community numbers about forty million people, within Indonesia and abroad. They are a very stable matrilineal society who gained independence from the Javanese in the fourteenth / fifteenth centuries through a buffalo fight. Both people introduced a buffalo to the fight in a field, with the winning buffalo to determine the victorious people. As the story goes, the Minangkabau starved a baby buffalo and sharpened his horns. On the day of the fight, the baby wanted milk, so he ran to the big male buffalo introduced by the Javanese and tried to suckle him. The horns of the baby ripped open the stomach of the big male buffalo and killed him. That was the end of Javanese patriarchal rule for the Minangkabau.

To commemorate this victory, buffalo horns are a prominent design feature in the culture: women wear horned headdresses; house roofs are shaped like horns. Traditional matrilineal longhouses face the peak of Mount Sarape, the mountain from which they originated in that land, having alighted there after crossing the ocean. The culture puts a strong emphasis on the concept of motherhood and the figure of the mother. The Minangkabau are the largest matrilineal / matriarchal Islamic culture in the world. Islam arrived sometime in the sixteenth century. There was conflict between the two ideologies in the eighteenth century, as the Muslims wanted to end the matrilineal features of the Minangkabau culture. The Padri War between the Muslims and the Minangkabau ended with the arrival of the Dutch who supported the Minangkabau. The two ideologies now live side-by-side under the traditional Minangkabau way known as *Adat* (local custom). *Adat* custom includes:

1. All land passes through women. Men do not inherit land.
2. Genealogies only trace women's descent.
3. Houses and land are owned by women. Brothers can use the land and work on it but do not inherit it.
4. Traditional customs are gendered and help to rule village life. But male and female work together and council house is shared by male and female councillors.

Peggy introduced the concept of the *matrixial*, the female counterpart to phallic, from Bracha L. Ettinger, a psychologist who wrote about the importance of the matrix. The characteristics of the matrixial are associated with the experience of a womb and mothering, including the pregnancy, birth, and growth experience (as opposed to the phallic meanings of those experiences). Minangkabau women's adat is matrixial, as they say that all that is born into the

world is born from the female. Fathers are only known from the confession of the mother. Therefore, males should protect the women because they are so important; women are supposedly weaker than men. Men live two lives: that of their mother's family (clan) and then their wife's family. Nature and growth are both very important essential values. Nature to nurture, growth in nature, Nature is their teacher. Women are associated with nature by having children and working in fields with their husbands. All women are called *Ibu*, meaning 'mother'. The ceremonies of women's adat form the core of village life, centering on cooking (and feasting) and maintaining good relationships between clans (peace). Their land is called *sabua*, meaning 'one womb'. All the land owned by one lineage is called sabua ('this land is our womb'). As all property is inheritable only through the matrilineal line, they say "We come from the land, it is our land and passed down thru the matri-line".

Peggy introduced the ceremony and story of the Queen, Bundo Kanduang, which is performed several times a year. The story opens with Bundo Kanduang teaching her son what he must know to be a proper king. When speaking to her errant son who was not paying attention, she reminded him of her power – "you really are an idiot, aren't you – have you forgotten that all Minangkabau is under my control and my power. If I have to, I can ask for help from them …". Older women have to train young men to be good citizens in order to maintain an egalitarian society. The ceremony celebrates not so much women as much as *the maternal*. Mothers have to teach sons how to be decent to live in a matriculture society. This womb-based model has powerful meanings for females and males. Even though we may have no memory of it, we have all been mothered.

After she learned Minangkabau culture, Peggy thought about the concept of matriarchy and concluded that it is not really a mirror image or a reflection of patriarchy. She noted the Latin roots for *mater* (mother) and *archy*. The later means 'rule' when used with patriarchy. Another meaning of the term, however, is 'beginning, source, action, first principle or element, principles of knowledge' and the like. So, both Peggy and Heidi Göttner-Abendroth, a German scholar, are redefining matriarchy with the second orientation of the term. They take 'matriarchy' to represent an egalitarian concept where power is shared, but which stresses the importance of the maternal; one that nurtures the social order. It does not reflect power *over subjects* but, rather, female responsibility to *conjugate* social ties in the here-and-now through leadership and example. It is a social ontology which gives control to women with their brothers over the economic in a way that authenticates, regenerates and nurtures the social order, and stresses the importance of the women. There are many examples of women-centred societies like this, where sovereign authority is with the maternal and public life is womb-centered, but this is not stressed in scholarship.

This presentation on the Minangkabau paved the way for an essential distinction between matriarchy (or patriarchies) that relates to governance and socio-political power, and matrilineality that relates to kinship and culture. The Minangkabau describe themselves as both matrilineal and matriarchal; but matrilineal societies are not necessarily matriarchal, and most do not exhibit any matriarchal features.

With reference to a slide of a statue in the presentation, a participant notes the electricity coming out of the statue's bowl at a power dam, saying that the statue is showing that the woman is the source of electricity just like the food. Why did they put the statue at the hydro dam? Why did they build the statue *there*? Is the dam an exploitation of the land or of women? Peggy says that the dam is the only source of energy in the region and women *are* the energy source for the culture. Therefore, the dam is not seen in a negative light as it may be in North America and the land for the dam was not expropriated.

Break

Introductions / reintroductions for newcomers

Where are the matrilineal societies in North America?
Presentation by Marie-Françoise Guédon
Back to the linguistic maps and the location of matrilineal tribes, we may notice the anomalous position of the Algonquian speaking tribes. Between thirty-five and fifty percent of Algonquian tribes in the US used to be matrilineal. However, in Canada, with one exception (and some of the Cree people who are considered to be bilateral), they are all listed officially as patrilineal, even when their American counterparts or relatives are identified as matrilineal. Why is it so? Did something happen so as to reduce the number of matrilineal Algonquians tribes in Canada? What would result from discovering that at least some of the Canadian Algonquian speaking tribes used to be matrilineal and/or matricultural? Would it make a difference in the present time? Much research needs to be done to explore that hypothesis. But if we take that possibility seriously, we could ask whether there are any matricultural features still alive in the Canadian Indigenous societies? Could they have survived the loss of their language? And how would we recognize them?

Group Discussion:
The residential school system goes back 150 years and impacted traditional knowledge, but as one participant notes, there are still elder Anishnaabeg-kwe who know that their community is matricultural. If you want to conquer a nation, you take their children. Everything the society believed in was challenged and affected by the (patriarchal) school system.

Another participant notes that even with respect to the Canadian matricultural communities most often cited in the literature, the Wendaki (Huron) and the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), one must keep in mind that most written documents have been written by men. The female realm was not recorded. The clan mothers' council was not recorded. Yet, historically, they had even more influence than the men. Luckily, it survived in oral history, but the imperial gaze says 'prove it'. (For instance, the Haudenausonee practice of adoption including deciding the fate and citizenship of captives was women's responsibility. Jesuit Relations documentation is useful but what is this source not saying, especially around the role of women? Indigenous people need to look at these documents because they can tell you what's missing.)

Today, young people are beginning to reconstruct the missing elements of their culture, which

absence was created by the male and scholarly gaze. Language carries the blueprint for the culture, and is the most direct key to unlocking it. Those who speak their language cannot be easily challenged because they understand nuances that others do not. The language used in rituals and in myths, such as the creation stories is particularly pregnant with basic principles.

A participant declares that communities need this new information. Suicide rates are high because people don't know which way to turn. Daughters are raising their children alone. How do we reclaim them? The community? We need champions in all areas to free us from laws that hurt us.

Participants recognize a need to organize a collective to work with communities. People were first affected by missionaries who saw the power of women and worked to undermine it. As individual Mi'kmaq clan mothers died, imperial governments replaced them with men under male grand councilors. When the British arrived, they colonized the region and did their best to get rid of the people. They too saw the power of the women who were allowed to speak in public. They also witnessed the caring given to children. The British fought this by portraying Mi'kmaq parental duties as 'uncivilized'. People living in longhouses were especially attacked by missionaries and colonists when women were in charge. The Mi'kmaq would make a good case study to reveal French Catholic influence, followed by the British impositions, then by the rules of the Canadian Indian Act. The Indian Act trained men to think they were and are the power in Mi'kmaq communities. So now Indigenous men have the power and most need convincing to let the women act. They don't speak their language and have been raised to believe in the power of men.

Lunch

We Are In Her And She Is In Us: rematriation through performance of the Haudenosaunee Sky Woman narrative
performance by Kahente Horn-Miller (Kanienkehaka (Mohawk) / Carleton)
Kahente notes that the story has been colonized by being written down by so many who filtered it through their own perspectives. How can a Kanawake woman reclaim it in a way that is true to herself? Rematriation of the story is her methodology. This provides the information to live by, how to plant beliefs. Deconstructing takes a lot of work and elder input, including permission to share the story in this way as a performance.

Entitled *We are in Her and She is in Us*, this presentation is a re-enactment of the middle part of this sacred origin story (when Sky Woman gives birth to her daughter) retold from a woman's perspective, and in the first person.

* live ritual performance (unrecorded) *

Group Discussion (led by Kahente):
Question about her tattoos. Kahente answers that her tattoos are the story, their history, which connects them to Sky World. She had the story tattooed on her arms, so that people see it and

ask, what is it? Answering gives her an opportunity to tell the story. Kahente wants to look at the Confederacy story too - Jigonhsasee is usually omitted.

A question comes about the Sky World. Kahente answers that the Sky World is where the earth meets the sky. it is where consciousness meets unconsciousness, the moment of awakening, the celestial tree. Together with the three sisters (corn, beans, squash), everything is interconnected. Corn is planted and beans are planted around the base. As the beans grow, they grow up the stalks. Around them is the square of squash plants that protect the plant from deer etc.

Kahente says that when she shares the story, the story is a ceremony, she is bringing us into it. She moves in a counterclockwise direction, which is typical of dancing in the Haudenosaunee longhouse; her feet never leave the soil when they dance so they remain connected to the land. It is embodied knowledge, connecting us to the story and to the natural world, and to the responsibility of being caretakers of the world. Our accountability is to the next seven generations. This is a very deep accountability that transforms how you live. What kind of impact will my actions have on the future generations? My story performance is the starting point of bringing us into the circle. This is the way we learn – through embodiment of the story. Archetypal story telling is always embodied. Giving birth is a very spiritual act, coming from Sky Woman through our body to the land.

There are different versions of the Sky Woman story (she falls, she is pushed, she jumps). It would be interesting to look at the different versions to see where and how the differences were created. But they all actualize ways of being, in societies where women are active participants.

Again, the issue of distinct worldviews vying for authority comes to the fore in a discussion about representation vs. being. The Western worldview is based on representative narrative whereas Iroquoian and Algonquian peoples consider the narrative as a participation, an embodiment. Someone notes that Indigenous people won't always know this, as it takes years to learn. The discussion is still turning around the need to transmit a knowledge at risk of being forgotten, and the difficulties inherent to being between two very different cultures

Albert Marshall's (Mi'kmaq Elder) *Etuaptmumk* or 'Two Eyed Seeing' is when you see something from one eye with Indigenous knowledge, from the Indigenous worldview, and with the other eye, you use Western knowledge and the Western worldview to get another understanding.

Break

Over the Generations, They Have Done Everything: Indigenous Women and Matrilineality
presentation by Kim Wakeford and Leah Quinlan, Native Women's Association of Canada / Policy Analysts and Researchers – Justice and Human Rights (see Appendix A for full

presentation)

> "If I am the object of some form of discrimination, it is very difficult for me to separate what happens to me because of my gender and what happens to me because of my race and culture. My world is not experienced in a linear and compartmentalized way. I experience the world simultaneously as Mohawk and as woman."
>
> - Patricia Monture-Angus

> "The voices, stories, and organizing of Indigenous women and Elders must be the central source of defining and revitalizing traditional matrilineal society systems."
>
> - anonymous

Introduction of the Native Women's Association of Canada: they are the political voice of Canadian Aboriginal women in overcoming sex-based discrimination on national and local bases. They are involved, for example, with the federal inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women.

Presenters noted that much of their information is not documented academically speaking in an academic way, but it is found in the bibliography.

Several important points were brought in that underlined, for the anthropologists, the cultural differences between the academic world and the Canadian Indigenous political world, but those points also emphasized, for the presenters, the continuing encroachment and disruption of the Indigenous world by scholars in their colonizing roles imposing their views.

White patriarchy versus Indigenous: Matrilineality across Turtle Island – women were knowledge carriers and political leaders, and colonial patriarchy disrupted these roles. Elders must be the central voices for matrilineality. The balance of gender roles is central, it is a collective balance.

Gender issues: Dr. Marie-Anne Battiste advises caution when dealing with ideas of genders among Indigenous communities. The pre-determined perspective of gender is not as important as the fact of being born into a community. Gender is about 'roles' for Europeans but extraordinary honours for Mi'kmaq people.

Individual versus community: The fight for justice and equal rights is good from one perspective and may be representative of traditional Indigenous cultures in some cases, but from another perspective it may be destructive in its emphasis on the individual rather than the individual within a community.

Colonialism: Europeans refused to negotiate with women. Gendered struggles have often been reduced to 'women's issues' rather than seeing them as representative of the broader cultural collision/deconstruction of colonialism.

Knowledge Ownership: How is truth, knowledge and wisdom constructed in the different cultures? How much is reflexivity encouraged? Research is used as a tool to legitimize a variety of agendas, including that of imperialism. How can research be used as a tool for legitimizing the Indigenous way of doing things – but legitimize for whom?

Conclusions –Indigenous matrilineal cultures have survived in spite of colonial and often academic disruption and intervention.
Then the presenter asked two questions of the participants:

1. Given that the First Nations understanding of gender is, generally speaking, neither hierarchical nor binary, how does the *matricultural* classification help us understand First Nations issues and communities any better? [That is patri- versus matri-cultures, what about other non-binary ways of talking.]
2. What, tangibly, does the theoretical delineation of the idea of *matriculture* do to ensure the survival of Indigenous matrilineal communities?

(NB: the full presentation is available in Appendix 2)

Group Discussion (led by NWAC team):
The dialogue turns mostly around three themes:
-Are we exploring the new concept of matriculturality? Do we agree it fits with Algonquian (Miq'maq, Anishnabeg, Cree, Blackfoot etc.) perspectives? To understand any culture, you must understand the role of women in that culture. The present categorization of Algonquian speaking peoples as patriarchal has impacted these peoples, especially women, greatly. Can the concept of matriculture be useful in this battle? Or is it another imposition of a label?

- The term 'matricultural' creates confusion. Further, participants were cautioned to be careful about binary gender formations, because Indigenous people have more genders than male and female, more sexualities than heterosexual. One response was that matricultural classification helps at least non-indigenous scholars to understand communities with women at the centre, and supports these societies in understanding themselves.

Identity is fluid in being a female: girl, woman, mother, employee, student, grandmother etc. which are very rich and important, we live them at different times. Key ideas are that these are not hierarchical nor are they binary. How does that shift our 'problematic'? Is the answer to bring genders and the matricultural *problematique* together? Within a patriarchal worldview, gender is only two: male and female. Matriculture goes beyond this. Women elders and teachers present their knowledge through embodiment and customs.

- Academic research has been a tool of legitimization for many things. Can it eventually be used by Indigenous scholars and their allies to legitimize their own needs or does it need to be thrown out altogether? Research has to be Indigenous-lead; scholars need to wait until they are invited to the table. Once there, they should follow the ethics of the nation. This is an act of reciprocity for a lifetime. There is also a question of how the Indigenous scholar can work the

settler academic system. These are two different questions.

Monture's work is very much from the Mohawk perspective, the cultural embodiment of a Mohawk woman. One needs to be careful how one uses her work, as there can be conflicting paths when compared to other works. A participant asks if any concepts or questions come from a colonizing view, as words tied to Western concepts are problematic; the individual scholar has to know the individual peoples.

Boat Harbour Research is a model of Indigenous-led research, where scholars were invited into the community because the water was making people sick. Indigenous women controlled the research and informed the scholars re: stories, and the scholars showed the women how to test the water and do the research, etc. The women knew they needed the information and they worked together. Research question needs to be asked by the community and the community should participate in the research. [The process is being filmed.]

Some anthropologists are looking at relationships beyond the West and Indigenous people by looking at nation states (China, US, Canada, etc). How do Indigenous peoples fare with these nation-states? How do you maintain your specific identity, community and culture in the face of these domineering nation-states? If they do it, if they still exist, how do they manage? How effective is their effort? Can flourishing cultures help those who are struggling? Scholars can't impose models or definitions but do need concepts for discussions.

Concluding remarks by the NWAC presenters:
How to help and listen to the people? The conversation should be about language, land, and women being in a state of wellness. This is why we do this work.

Lateral violence is a huge issue for communities of Indigenous women, but we need to be proud of each other's accomplishments. Too many jealous comments – we need healing.

Matriculture is a holistic term. There is a need for some discussion on its meaning. Winona LaDuke talks about this and she would be a good matron for the project.

Beware of imposing values and choices on communities. There is need for us to be something that challenges the systems of the status quo and that helps us restructure, rebuild ourselves as a people. Balance is vital.

Conclusion and reflections on Day Two (26 April 2017) by the organizers
Two kinds of questions are emerging from day two. First are questions concerning the community: what difference does it make for a community to live in a matrilineal social system? What difference does it make for a community to live with a strong matriculture? Does it influence how women are respected? In today's socio-political dynamic, does the identification of an Indigenous community as presently or formerly matrilineal have an impact on its status, role, or opportunities? Do the women in that community play or have played historically

recognized political and economic roles?

Second, there are other questions concerning the researchers, anthropologists, historians, linguists and other scholars. For instance, they are asking: What difference does it make to think from a cultural perspective with the term matriculture? What kind of approaches do we trigger when we focus on matrilineal descent and kinship and when we focus on the cultural context? Can these approaches be interpreted as just another attempt to colonize Indigenous women's lives, at yet another level, since all those concepts are created by the West?

In retrospect, we, the organizers, who had anticipated a cultural gap between the Indigenous representatives and administrators of Indigenous organizations on the one hand, and the academic world in general on the other hand, had failed to recognize that this was too simplistic a view. We should have learned from the refusal of many organizations to concretely participate in our activities, and from the lack of interest specifically demonstrated by many scholars in Native Studies but also in Women's Studies, Gender Studies and Critical Studies departments, among other academic disciplines. And we should have noticed the academic sophistication of the views and ideas expressed by Indigenous women's media as informed by Women's Studies and Cultural Studies. It might be more useful to consider the cultural gap separating anthropologists from their academic peers and from Indigenous organizations at the same time, while Indigenous researchers involved at the grass root level are left stranded in the middle. We will have to address this when we talk about agenda and next steps.

c) Day Three - Thursday, 27 April 2017: Toward a common agenda

Prayer Circle
A Mikm'aq elder gathered us in a prayer circle to open the day.

Review of Days One and Two (including markers of matriculture)
led by Linnéa Rowlatt
We review the first two days, and this spurs new discussion by the group about concrete indicators in the field of matrilineal identity and related processes. From working with matricultural communities in China, Africa, South America, and North America, InterCulture has noticed the need for plain and practical markers or indicators of matrilineal kin groups in the way people talk and behave. The discussion focused on the following markers:

- One identifies oneself as belonging to one's mother's lineage or clan;
- The kin groups (whether lineages, clans or moieties – the society is divided in at least two sides) are named;
- A most important indicator is the strong bond between brother-sister relationship when they are children of the same mother (often marked by ritual avoidance when lineages, clans or moieties are exogamous), and the subsequent bond between mother and mother's brother.

- A second big marker is the active role of the mother's brother in a woman's family. He is the male authority in the family, especially for boys. The father holds different responsibilities; he often is a teacher rather than a disciplinarian. The mother's brother disciplines and takes care of his sisters' kids. The mother's mother may hold even greater authority.
- The kin groups in most matrilineal societies are exogamous: one is to marry outside one's clan or lineage;
- The land is often linked to the kin groups acting as corporate units;
- Kin terms reflect the social system by lumping together children of sisters, and distinguishing the boundary between parallel cousin (children of sisters, or children of brothers) from the boundary between cross cousins (children of siblings of different sex or children of brother and sister);
- Is your mother's brother referred to by a different term than your father's brother?
- Kinship terminology: Persons belonging to the same clan and the same generation tend to be addressed by the same terms: Mother and mother's sister, father and father's brother , father's sister differentiated from mother's sister. Children of two sisters are called by the same terms as one's brothers and sisters, often children of two brothers are also called by the same terms. Children of a brother and a sister (cross-cousins) are called by a term that is different from the terms used for one's own brother and sisters
- Kin behavior's rules: mother's brother and mother's mother are more authoritarian; father and father's brother as well as father's sister are friendly and supportive, often in charge of rituals (rites of passage)
- inheritance of land rights, social status, ceremonial rights or political formal responsibilities are through the mother's line.
- Households are often built around a female core with an older woman and her sisters , these women's daughters and unmarried sons, and these daughters's daughters and their children.
- To preserve the strength of the family, cross-cousins are often advised to marry each other.

Linnéa concluded her review of Day Two with a summary of the NWAC discussion from the previous afternoon, noting that NWAC is the umbrella organization for many but not all Indigenous women. Their challenge about the value and use of the concept of matriculture to Indigenous women brings us face-to-face with current political realities of Canadian Indigenous women. She focused the discussion on answering this challenge, and asks the question: how can we help each other individually and as a group? What are the specific and universal challenges?

Group Discussion:
Please note that comments during this session were grouped thematically.
During the group discussion, a new question was introduced: By what or whom do Indigenous women want to be led? We need to connect to governments (federal, provincial, tribal) and teach them, as they are part of the problem and must be part of the solution.

A- The challenges for academics

A- 1 Working with Indigenous Organizations

A question about the funding and the fewer-than-anticipated number of participants at the workshop – why so few? InterCulture responded that NWAC was the only group to support us and they offered in-kind support through communicating and promoting the workshop. Why didn't the other groups and institutions we approached? A discussion followed about the groups we approached and didn't approach. It comes down to one issue, that of financing. With the exception of the University of Ottawa, none of the organizations we approached, whether local or national, could contribute money, especially travel money for our Central or Western Canadian guests. And most of them did not judge our work relevant to their own needs.

A- 2 Working with interested communities and individuals

We all agree on the primary need to set up collaborative processes with specific communities. InterCulture was advised to be in touch with people who are already involved in some way with Indigenous women / Indigenous feminism. Some names that were mentioned include Paula Allen Gunn, Emma Larocque, J. Green and others in the West, Verna St. Dennis. Winona LaDuke who is writing about matricultures. Local women elders can be a council of elders. *Honour the Earth*, LaDuke's organization, offers grants and she has done work with environmental sustainability. She includes matriculture in this work.

Marie-Françoise warned us that not everyone is willing to work specifically on matricultural issues, even though women's issues are usually received favorably. The most negative reaction is that matrilineality is unimportant or no longer relevant or that present matrilineal societies are more fantasy than reality. Scholars in Women's Studies have often been openly hostile; she has been accused of weakening the feminist cause by suggesting that there are societies where women are not victims. A comment was made that in some ways it may be easier for Indigenous women because they don't have many scholars in the different fields. However, there are new opportunities; the University of New Brunswick is very open at the moment.

We discussed models of collaboration. If InterCulture's initiatives / programs are not led through Indigenous knowledge, Indigenous people will not come. We also agree that the information we collect should be made available with no strings attached. With respect to this workshop, Linnéa will write up a report and send it to all participants for feedback. Once feedback is integrated, then the report will go to many including the above-mentioned Indigenous feminist scholars. We will then make it available to the communities, researchers, and scholars we have already identified. [This basically means to build a network; and think about website and other media of communication.]

Break

A- 3 The challenge for academics in Indigenous contexts

A participant said that safety and security are extremely important needs to create true dialogue for Indigenous women. They are practical needs that will help Indigenous women to share. They need to have these practical needs addressed. In this context, scholarly language, as well as methodology and goals, can be off-putting and must be guided by how Indigenous

people themselves are talking about it. We need allies to show up in partnership to bear witness (like in courts), which would validate our knowledge and the message. Specifically, she continued, we need some of the research presented here written down to counterbalance the writings of patriarchal society. Keep in mind the elders' knowledge and value it as much as a scholar's knowledge. Consider the knowledge keepers, ceremonial keepers, and language speakers. Another participant mentioned UNB's elder-in-resident has an MA but cannot sit on a PhD committee because she does not have a PhD. Same with an elder at another university - she can sit on a committee but cannot vote. This fails to respect Indigenous knowledge systems.

A discussion ensued about elders not being given the power to vote in dissertation defenses and that it is so important to have support for Indigenous students as well as role models.

A participant asserted that they were at the workshop to get allies for confronting the people with power, and that the Mi'kmaq and other First Nations have their own road. Indigenous Studies works alongside and within the box; changes are very gradual. Marie-Françoise shared her perspective on the university, in that it is like a forest – a place to gather, to collect what we need (colleagues, data, money, etc) in order to do the work we want to do. If I want to plant trees in the university / forest, then we need a PhD, which is like a passport. But our goal is to develop and preserve knowledge, not to acquire a diploma. Knowledge and traditions cannot be preserved on shelves, they have to feed a community in order to remain alive.

A participant said that it is hard for Indigenous women to stop the herd. Young people have heard so much about universities that they want them, but how do they stop the herd? What can we do to support the foundations of our culture? To instill this kind of power in the longhouse? In the clan system? In the clan mothers? In the past the clan mothers and the longhouse were the foundations, they kept the cultural knowledge and distributed resources; they had economic power. We need the cultural keepers because Indigenous people are suffering the consequences of the Western loss of their own cultural keepers.

We continued to reflect on the issues based on the themes of this workshop, trying to identify stakeholders, the most affected, deepening our understanding of the importance of this, and looking for solutions.

Lunch

Afternoon Session 1
Please note: the discussion was fast. Comments are identified as best as possible.

B- Challenges within Indigenous communities themselves: What Indigenous women are facing
An Indigenous participant said the 'matriculture' term is the key. As women, we have been so accommodating that we have put our own stories aside. We've done it so much that we raised a male god and lifted the men in our communities. That's my reality in my community and the reality of some of the women in other communities. Women leaders have gained a bit more

ground. We have not been asked, 'What is it that you want?' Our voices have not been heard / uttered. It's 'we don't want to rock the boat' thinking. Kahente showed us another way to transmit knowledge with her dancing – and it is important that she is a professor – she brings some legitimacy to our way of thinking. Some of the questions that were shared here – we are introducing them back into the community, questions like decolonizing and re-introducing our language.

Another participant asked: where could this go? One of the bigger challenges is the work we need to do inside ourselves – we need a lot of healing – but we can't delay the project because of all the healing we need. The issue of murdered and missing women is on-going; it doesn't really matter what stage it's at, the fact that it exists is amazing. There has been so much oppression in the system that women have feared to rock the boat. There's a two-row wampum belt from 1701, which says that we live our way and you live your way. We need to be aware of the violence and racism in the legal and political systems, and the lateral violence in communities. We need to deal with that right and to do that, we need to be able to take advantage of the current administration (that is not Stephen Harper) and we have to talk with our neighbors, especially after the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia fishing rights issue.

An example: Walking With Our Sisters, the artist memorial to MMIW which was a Peace and Friendship Initiative from the United Church (Jan-Feb 2017), based on pairs of vamps representing missing loved ones. It was created with much protocol. Any time the memorial was displayed, the gallery had to fund it and fund family expenses for whoever wanted to come, and the money could not be from oil. The memorial brought students, faculty, and community together. They all had to be smudged in order to go through the exhibit together, through 1800 pairs of vamps by the time it came to Halifax. The focus was on the family - it was a wake, an opportunity for families to heal. Families told their stories, grandmothers were there. Weaving the art within what you are doing helps you dilate. Walking With Our Sisters brought a lot of awareness and is an interesting model. (*Here is the URL: http://walkingwithoursisters.ca/*)

One of the biggest challenges is starting our own healing – but there's also the disconnect between us and our ancient ways. We need to remember that the men have also been disconnected from who they are. Today, Indigenous peoples are disconnected from their own traditions, especially in the east, so one of the biggest challenges is bringing men on board. We need healing for men and teachings for young men because so many have lived away from the grandmothers. We need people to surround us and help us create our safe space.

We see all of these people in prisons and they shouldn't be there. Then they come back to our communities with their violence and infections (drugs, etc.). Call it violence, that's what it really is. We need to build towards righting relations, and not always focus on terminology. The Kathryn Donnelly Foundation gave five years of funding to address violence. We have so many women, such as Josie Augustine, who need to be paid to go wherever they are needed. Hearing about the challenges that (*another participant's*) people are facing – how can we help her and how can she help us?

Question: what about restorative justice?

Reply: the cultural support systems are not in place.

A participant notes that the worst form of punishment is public shaming. Our support system is not in place to make this happen. We have a restorative system of justice that is not recognized by our own people. We need the master to acknowledge something when it happens – and once it is acknowledged, then there is a movement. The fact is that a disempowered mother cannot raise an empowered son. Because of the Indian Act, you could not even sit in a circle. Circles weren't allowed, not even in the 1990s!

Question: How can we educate to support women? What can we do with the young people who don't understand their clan system? Or even other traditions. Especially in those communities where women were affected by the Indian Act. It's become a mess. We need knowledge keepers; some knowledge is gone. The bureaucrats have males doing the jobs of women and they would have to let go of that power. Women are having to negotiate in patriarchal systems, and we are punished when we aren't submissive to the system.

A participant noted that men have power in Indigenous cultures, they're the pipe keepers, sweatlodge keepers, etc., and now they come with rules that they try to impose on women. Some are violent or abusive. There is a lack of support and a need for protection in the community. Lateral violence is very real there. Women need to learn to rock the boat.

Another participant noted that she understands that this is going to take a LOT of time. Colonization was hard; decolonization will be harder.

A participant talked about some of her indigenous female students. Some were shamed and call "whites" by their neighbors because they had acquired university degrees. Their Band Councils tried sometimes to force them out of the community in order to destroy the network they had built within their community, even though they belonged to matrilineal societies. Today, this is changing. But the Indian Act and its administrators still discriminate against women; and especially against women working as the bearers and transmitters of their language and culture. And matrilineal systems are not a panacea, and they cannot be imposed. It would also mean a different way to claim one's Indigenous identity.

Question: who is Mi'kmaq? This is an issue. Multi-race families include white women who married into the community. They don't share the culture, so it also raises questions of treaty rights, inherent rights, and citizenship law. Who has the right to vote to even decide who is Mi'kmaq? Do we decide by blood quantum? Will we set criteria like if you speak the language, you get a certain number of points, or if you know the culture or have money, you get points? The Indian Act created this situation, not the communities. The big question is *how do we decolonize?* Are there traditional ways that can be used? Can we rematriate pre-colonial authority?

A participant notes that the Git'ksan on the west coast have two forms of political power. There is official "Indian status" and modern councils for one way of acting and doing things. There is also a second way that is traditional and based on matrilineages ('house') and clans. Sometimes there is an overlap but sometimes the two don't overlap; and the most knowledgeable elders and chiefs may find themselves without official status. The traditional form of power is the one that deals with cultural issues.

A participant notes that the Mi'kmaq have twenty years to deal with land claims, and who is and who isn't Mi'kmaq, but while this is going on, we're still losing our culture. We need to start the process and hopefully we'll establish at least a framework as different issues need to be resolved.

Another participant notes that the Mi'kmaq are reclaiming our words. We are taking the Western layer off our language to see what we are really saying. We are sharing our stories and documenting everything. These become important. For example, our words for 'half-sister' and 'half-brother' are specific. They mean the children have the same father but different mothers – different wombs. That's in the language and in the teaching. If the children have the same mother but different fathers, they are considered full sister and brother. Another example of the importance of language is that in Mi'kmaq, the moon is grandmother and the sun is mother. Both terms are feminine. Earth is mother; the sky is father.

We have to live in two worlds. When we speak in English, as an Indigenous person, we get into that canoe, the one in the two row wampum belt, and then we return to our own canoe when we return to our own language. Including having to explain things; and end up adding gender. The institution of the university is not representative of Indigenous culture. Even when they're trying to teach Indigenous language, they are not teaching it right, because the verbs and the pronouns are different. It's stressful to deal with this. We want some of the things in a westernized world but not all of it.

Question: the issue is biculturalism – how will you act with it?

A participant shares that when her husband was 31 years old, he was dying. He was healed by the sweatlodge and owes his living to the ancient ways. He says, I walk with a computer in one hand and the drum in the other. In order to be bilingual, you need to have a language to begin with. You learn the language in your mother's womb; that's old memory. These institutions are designed to nurture and complement each other but they often lead to a split identity, what another participant called 'bifurcation of the soul'.

Another participant noted that, when you go back to the land, there is no stress. You are back in the womb. Now, we are suffering from PTSD, from generational trauma. We're disconnected from society. But we can help ourselves with our own traditions and ceremonies. We need to deconstruct traditional knowledge and ask, Is it the Mi'kmaq way? There is so much violence against women, which is social violence. Women can be abusers too.

A participant identified another huge challenge, which is faced by graduate students dealing with professors who hit on them. There is also lateral violence against Native women students, and also with speaking outside their community, where they get challenged by other Indigenous peoples for not being correct, but it's because each nation has its own way. We need forums and workshops like these, where we can talk and share. We need talking circles, gatherings, sharing circles, to share our personal history, our family history, and to talk about recovery and what it means. There is an awakening need for the cultural foundations held by the clan mothers. We need to bring in information that nurtures the clan mothers and reclaims their work. We need to deconstruct the pipe, what does the pipe mean? The bowl is female, the stem is male, and women were the pipe carriers, not the men. But in Europe, smoking was for men. Women were also carriers of the wampum belts, which are the treaties. We need to build alliances and networks.

Break

Afternoon Session 2

Where research could take us - Research topics and applied research
Group Discussion
As far as InterCulture's third goal is concerned, it is obvious that we do not have the critical mass of participants needed to take on the task of creating a Canadian agenda for research on Canadian Indigenous matricultures. This is due partly to a lack of funding that prevented Western Canadian potential participants to attend the proceedings, partly to the lack of interest demonstrated by the answers to our invitations, partly to the very small number of scholars interested in matrilineal systems or matriculture (including our colleagues in Women's Studies), and partly to the disdain shown by First Nations when faced with yet another intrusion of Western scholarship.

However, we could focus on the issues that are with us at this point.

A participant shared that when she was a child, during the week, she stayed at a convent. She went home only on the weekends. She started observing everything around her and started being an anthropologist as a child because that's the only way she could survive. She noticed that there is a relationship between creation stories and women's roles and status. In her first book, *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality*, she found a high correlation between the story and society. If the story focused on a woman or a woman and a man, then the society generally gendered an egalitarian model. If the story focused on a man and warfare, then there was a high correlation with male dominance. Matrilineal kinship was probably the first form of society and male dominance came later and likely around periods of warfare or migration. In any case, we have to continue supporting projects exploring the features of myths and other stories expressing a matricultural orientation.

Among the topics deemed important, the participants discussed culturally-specific models of puberty and womanhood, correlations between matriculture and birth-giving practices and

outcomes, potential links between matriculture and acceptance of non-heterosexuality, and even pre-colonial Indigenous inheritance patterns. In all these issues, linguistic continuity remains a priority, both as research tool and as mean to promote traditional values and matricultural orientations. We agreed to enlarge our field of research to explore linguistic similarities and variations among matricultures. As well, we recommended that future research on the subject of matriculture would have to explore cultural features that have endured through colonization and their recent role in Indigenous societies, a role that may become crucial.

We agree that there has been a tendency to ignore the consequences of reintroducing old knowledge about past cultural orientations, about gender roles and former political systems, but reviving or rectifying one's history can instill pride and provide tools that can be applied to present situations. An issue was identified of drug dealers in a specific community, but the men on the Band Council are relatives of the drug dealers, so opponents of the trade find their homes and cars vandalized. We need a revolution where we can fight with peace tools.

Conclusion and reflections on Day Three (27 April 2017) by the organizers

In retrospect, participants were shy about concretizing any plan. If we decide that InterCulture's present job, as members of this academic team, is to support the continuity of cultural knowledge in Indigenous communities, then we have to place ourselves openly at the service of the communities, not to sanction their opinion and declaration, but to promote and to support those who need hard academic skills to build up their knowledge base: elders, knowledge-keepers, clan mothers, and so on. Historians, archivists, linguists, ethnographers, and others have skills that have been learned and can be taught. That supposes a dedicated web site, workshops and publications, though not necessarily in the usual media.

The organizers and their Indigenous partners still find themselves confronted with the demands expressed by many communities to support the restoration of an often-forgotten worldview within which flourished the matriculture they recognize as part of their cultural identity(ies). But who would engage into such a process? How would they pursue it? How much of that heritage is still available is a recurrent question explicit in the ethnographies and other primary sources. There is no ideal past.

In retrospect, though we noted the importance of the recommendation to explore cultural features that have endured through colonization and the recent role of these features in Indigenous societies, we failed to follow its ramification and to discuss its feasibility. Yet recovering meaningful components of past matricultural systems *is* feasible as a long term if not as an on-going formal program, not so different from the linguistic recovery programs attempted today. At the community level, it would provide the intangible infrastructure that could successfully support a community through a crisis and lead to long-term cultural revival and, even, community health. At the academic level, it would have to call upon a multidisciplinary approach including ethnographic, linguistic and historical methods, among other skills, keeping in mind the fluidity and the creativity inherent to cultural processes.

We all recognize the need to update mistaken, vague, and partial definitions of matrilineal and matricultural societies, thereby introducing up-to-date anthropological and ethnohistorical concepts into the discourse of human sciences about such societies. But we have to go farther than that and be open to a redefinition of basic concepts, such as power, authority, domesticity, or motherhood. Moreover, this critical review has to rely on ethnographic data, not on ideology, and the research process should respect the specific situation of each cultural community rather than engaging into generalizations. Our agenda has to engage into an active witnessing of what is happening in the contemporary Indigenous world as it reclaims and adapt large segments of its cultural heritage.

We also missed the opportunity to discuss the problems inherent in the notion of "Indigenous Knowledge". This term encompasses so many different forms of knowledge, all of it fully integrated into Indigenous cultures. Generally, anthropologists are suspicious when the term is used, partly because Indigenous knowledge that may be packaged into a scientific format (environmental maps, animal behaviors, distribution of resources, demography, genealogies, etc.) can be marketed and used dishonestly. This is partly because Indigenous knowledge that can be packaged is *not* scientific knowledge. Scientific knowledge tries to be narrow, precise, controlled, objective and universal, which cultural knowledge in general and Indigenous cultural knowledge, specifically, is not. Instead, Indigenous knowledge casts a wide-ranging net on the life and traditions of a community, including myths, rituals, individual memories, and always relationships rather than objects. That view of knowledge is forgotten or distorted when one tries to equate it with scientific data (See Cruikshank, *Do Glaciers Listen?*). Recognizing the difference is not a lack of respect; it is to acknowledge the immense cultural difference between scientific enterprise and cultural wisdom, and the real difficulties encountered by scholars in attempting to bring them together, especially younger Ph.D. candidates working on a topic close to their heart and having to squeeze and mold their life experience into the little boxes required for a Ph.D. thesis. That is where the real insults are felt.

d. Day Four: Friday, 28 April 2017

Prayer Circle
A Mi'kmaq elder gathered us in a prayer circle to open the day; each of us offered a thought to connect with the divine.

A participant commented that there are two important components of matricultures: women's culture, and women's role in transmitting cultural knowledge.

Morning Session
<u>presentation by Catherine Martin</u>
Catherine introduced the Catherine Donnelly Foundation and the project her group is undertaking with their financial support. It's called Righting Relations, for both among ourselves and with the settlers in the Maritimes. The Foundation is funding three hubs of women-led initiatives for adult education for radical social change:

- Maritimes, which is her group. Right now, they are recording teachings from Mi'kmaq elders. There is a profile of each woman that is being recorded – who she is and what she does, and the teaching that she has given.
- Central, based out of Toronto, which focuses on immigrant communities and women-led initiatives.
- West, which focuses on low-income communities and again women-led initiatives.

Catherine then showed us two videos that are still in process of being finalized: the teaching elder is Josie Augustine and the community is the Elsipogtog Mi'kmaq Community.
- *Josie's Profile:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zQVOCmNCh6s and
- *Josie's Teaching*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n8UEUXi9uLE

The goal in their project revolves around *Righting Relations* – but what does this mean? What did it mean in the original model? It's very important to reach the boys and the men. As Josie stated, the men need medicine bundles to connect them to Spirit. It's not so important for women because we are the ones who give life and our periods automatically connect us. Yet, women nowadays do need some rituals; we need cleansing because of the environment and because of the kind of experiences so many of us are having. Sweetgrass is so important due to the fact that it's braided like our hair.

Catherine also talked about Saint Kateri, who brought her a message in a church, and the COTY Institute, as well as various case studies. She also mentioned women's gathering in New Brunswick from May 24-28 and invited those present to come.

Catherine and another participant talked about the strawberry ceremony. The strawberry is the heart of women and is linked to a girl's rite of passage in womanhood. It's a very important first celebration of a girl becoming a woman. It's the first berry and the first voice has to come from the heart. "We begin to celebrate when the flower comes out and then when the berry is blood red. It connects with the women's moons to show she's come to the age of flowering. Everyone gathers in recognition of who we are. Women are central to this ceremony. This is where life comes from. This is where we receive our knowledge, our truth, our heart. If we collect and eat the strawberries – it's the medicine to help us through those times, through the winter". Strawberries represent the knowledge of our mother (Mother Earth). "As I was eating, I was reconnecting – and then I ate on behalf of my mother, and on her mother's behalf, and on my daughter's behalf. Eventually, I had a vision of strands of connection". When our ceremonies were attacked or buried, that is when we began to be disempowered.

Catherine continued her talk with a presentation about her trip to Honduras. There, she learned about Berta Cáceres, a Honduran woman who spoke out about the environment and what was happening in Honduras. She was murdered a year and a half ago. The murderers also shot Gustavo Castro Soto who was her guest at the time, but he disguised himself as dead. She died in his arms. Gustavo Castro Soto's life was also in danger, but her group was able to get him out of the country and he is still alive.

(*From Cheryl: For more information about Berta, see the following articles on the event:*
https://www.democracynow.org/2016/3/8/honduran_activist_berta_caceres_died_in
https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/feb/28/berta-caceres-honduras-military-intelligence-us-trained-special-forces
http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/the-death-of-berta-caceres
https://www.democracynow.org/2016/3/11/before_her_assassination_berta_caceres_singled
https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/aug/31/hillary-clinton-honduras-violence-manuel-zelaya-berta-caceres)

Catherine described how mining companies in Honduras, including Canadian mining companies, are violating human rights. Who is our government supporting? What is Goldcorp hiding? In such countries, the last people you call are the police. But, even here in Canada, the police are the last people you call in many communities.

Break

Responses to NWAC's questions from Day 2
Presentation by Marie-Françoise Guédon with ad hoc *interventions from the group*
Marie-Françoise Guédon: Those questions matter. They can be distilled as "What use is matrilineality today?" and "How can the concept of matriculture help Canadian Indigenous women now?" Before attending to these questions, I would like to mention four points:

First: it should be reiterated that it's not because something is matrilineal (or matriarchal, matrifocal, whatever) that it is necessarily better. Matrilineality in itself is no guarantee for a peaceful society, or for the respect of women's rights. And we have to rebut any tendencies to romanticize matrilineality or matriculture.

Second, from an anthropological perspective, not all Canadian Indigenous groups are or used to be matrilineal (though many Algonquian speaking communities possibly used to be matrilineal).

Third, we must understand that concepts and terminology do matter because they carry connotations that may reinforce or weaken the original worldview. The NWAC presenters are right to think that words are dangerous.

And metaphors are dangerous because they carry hidden connotations. What are the metaphors we use to talk about women? about sex, about pregnancy and birth? What are the implications of the metaphors in our academic disciplines? They influence our attitudes about ourselves, about genders and the attitudes of others about women. For example, the Mediterranean and European tendency to think of peace in terms of whiteness, passivity, weakness, sheep, or innocent lambs – and femininity, when we need to think of peace in terms of redness, life, fertility, a room for action and freedom, a lioness with her cubs. See Jean Houston: *The Possible Human*, for this suggestion. And yes, the term 'matriculture' leads us to

think of society by reference to motherhood, and female, though not necessarily in binary terms. Some authors prefer terms like 'gynocentricity or women-centered', but we would have to find societies with that emphasis in mind.

Finally, we talk about matricultural systems as cultural systems like we talk about kinship systems as cultural systems. Essentially, cultural systems are those systems which can be recognized from one culture to the next, one society to the next, in spite of enormous differences in content, because they seem to deal with similar functions or similar forms. Geertz gives art, religion, jokes, or myths as examples of cultural systems. Notice how all cultural systems have to do with how people *think* about life, the world and themselves. All societies have cultural systems, but not all cultural systems are found in all societies. Though most cultural systems are found in all societies, they can vary in intensity and development. In the same way, though all societies have to deal with sex and genders, with birth and mothers and with women, among related concepts, some societies allow little room for a matricultural system to flourish. Others take men and women, and others, as equal participants in the cultural life. Matrilineality supposes a strong matriculture. But little research has been done.

Question One: What use is matrilineality today for Indigenous people in Canada at Community Level?

Group Discussion: At the community level, does it make a difference to any of us if women can identify themselves as a member of a matrilineal society rather than a patrilineal one?

For most of us here, it does. It gives us an identity and a sense of strength – just in the term itself. Femaleness is valued, girls are valued, mothers and grandmothers are respected. at the center of their family. It would position women in a visible position.

Policy Level:

Marie-Françoise proposes some examples**:** Would it make a difference if social services dealing with Indigenous communities knew grandparents were to be involved in the lives of grandchildren, which is a key marker of matrilineal societies? And if they knew about the rights and expectations held by the mother's brother? What if social services could consider extended families as positive features instead of suspicious social arrangements?

Discussion: There was a general consensus among the Indigenous women present that it does matter how Indigenous people are labeled, it matters how informed policy makers are. What if the Indian Act accepted the fact that not all Canadian Indigenous tribes are patrilineal, and actually treated men and women in the same way?

Societal Level*:*

Marie-Françoise Guédon: At an even larger level, let us look at the way in which Canadian society is organized.

For instance, let us discuss the case of Sandra Lovelace, the Maliseet woman, which was a

human rights issue concerning the Indian status of Indigenous women marrying a white man, which led to the judicial decision that she had been discriminated against on the basis of her gender. The government responded with the recognition that: “many of the provisions of the *Indian Act*, including section 12(1)(b) require serious reconsideration and reform.” But the Canadian government stressed the necessity of maintaining the status quo of the *Indian Act* in that matter as an instrument to protect the Indian minority of Canada. The government lawyers stated in court that “Aboriginal peoples traditionally had patrilineal families, which determined legal claims to land. Further, they stated that the non-Indian men (as opposed to non-Indian women) were a threatening force to reserve land of the Indian and, for these reasons, legal enactments from 1869 provided that an Indian woman who married a non-Indian man would lose her status.” (Boyer, p. 83). In other words, the government saw land as belonging to men. If Indian men married white women, they still owned the land but if Indian women married white men, the whites would get the land and gradually Indians would lose their territories.

Group Discussion
This example shows us how a bit of historical information can change our perspective on, for instance, the situation of the Algonquian-speaking Canadians.

Question 2: How can the concept of matriculture help Canadian Indigenous women now?

Marie-Françoise Guédon: What does it change if we place matrilineality in a cultural context called matriculture?

It reminds us that matrilineal kinship, in the form of lineage and clans, matters only if it is supported and celebrated by cultural features: communal rituals, stories and myths, knowledge, rules of transmissions of resources and information; links to ancestors and so on.

Group Discussion
An increase sense of identity and security for the women would be a first benefit.

A participant noted that it is important for men too. She mentioned the Mosuo men, in China explaining to her how their links to the mother and to their mother’s house were secure and unbreakable - without men having to fight for status or control;

Speaking of matriculture helps us consider the links between social structures and cultural as well as linguistic heritage. It also provides a link with what we have begun to call “matriarchal features” such as Indigenous models of female authority, of female mobility (like the women in Iroquois or Tsimshian myths who go by themselves on sacred quests, of female political figures, of male relationships with themselves and their communities informed by a matricentric ideal (See Georges Sioui’s work).

Marie-Françoise also referred to the Delgamuukw case. In the original decision, the judge stated that Git’ksan culture died at the time of contact. The people have adapted to Canadian society

and are no longer the Git'ksan people of the past. This made it easy to conclude that the people did not own traditional Git'ksan land. His decision was later reversed. This case demonstrates the need to emphasize that Indigenous cultures are alive now, in the present, and to articulate what they are.

Another example: currently, the Algonquin Grandmothers are taking the chiefs to court over land claim issues. Showing their culture from a matricultural perspective would help their claim for the right to represent their community since governance is part of the matricultural system.

Group Discussion
We have to consider how much of the "traditional" cultures and values are tied up to the matrilineal social organization. True, you cannot impose a clan system (especially matriclans) on a society that has become bilateral and is sustained by the English kinship terminology, and that no longer lives within tight communities where everyone knows everyone else. Yet, knowing more about history and the social systems of the past may strengthen cultural preservation efforts. It would also accentuate the specificity and the richness in the cultural heritage of the Indigenous groups.

If we want to use the term *matriculture* to support what Indigenous communities are trying to do, then we need to make sure that the term says what we want it to say. We need to make sure that the term is not appropriated and distorted.

Marie-Françoise Guédon: So what can we find in a matricultural cultural system?

First, everything that has to do with one's connections with one's mother, daughter, sister and wife or any kin of another sex, and by extension the whole kinship system, as well as treatment of boys and girls by society; negative and positive connotations in the perception of genders

Therefore, everything that has to do with motherhood, mothers, connections with ancestors in the mother line; this leads to womanhood, the definition of femininity and masculinity, the view of sex and gender, the relationship between womanhood and sexuality, between womanhood and motherhood.

Then everything that has to do with birth and birth rituals, children, care of children, as well as procreation, pregnancy, fertility, who controls the fertility of the women? Father's side? Mother's brother? Grandmother? Or the woman herself?

Also: puberty, treatment of girls at puberty, puberty rituals, how much do girls learn about what is happening to them, integration of young women into the group;

The relationship of people of all genders with their body, how much do they control? What about genital mutilation, circumcision? Do the women learn to recognize when they are fertile, do they know about to prevent or interrupt a pregnancy?

Sexuality and the metaphors used to talk about it, sexual pleasure;

The relationship with what is defined as nurturing, source of being, (such as the land, or the water, or the light),

The use of masculine and feminine as metaphors to talk about reality, or about the cosmos, or about nonhuman or sacred dimensions (animals, spirits, divinities).

All the basic principles ("root principles" in Pinxten's terms) that surround mothers and women. We talk about a strong matriculture when that system is positively oriented toward women.

Break

Features of a strong matriculture, articulated collectively by participants
group discussion based on stickies on the wall

- Cosmogeny / cosmology which emphasizes the active role of women in the creation/origin of the world; the centrality of women to myths; in quest stories, women figure as active agents, not prizes.
- Rituals demonstrating a positive evaluation of menarche and puberty for girls and / or a positive evaluation of menopause. In a patricentric society, menopausal women have no value, but in a matricentric society, menopausal women are very important because they are the ones to transmit culture.
- The mutuality of the community of women, including sharing the role of mother among one's sisters' children or age-mates' children. For example, a baby may be breastfed by all the mothers in the community. When the baby is unwrapped (after 1 year or so), he-she knows everyone as mother. When the biological mother is away, the child doesn't care because the mother is still there. *Discussion* We're not sure whether this is a feature of matriculture – it may be a marker of Indigenous society regardless of whether the society is matricentric or patriarchal.
- Girls are valued as much as boys. *Comment* Mi'kmaq children are named after our animal relatives (bear, otter). Among the Tsimshian, little boys are nicknamed after animals and little girls are nicknamed after fruit.
- At home, the focus is on the extended family. Either today or in the past, would you welcome your grandparents at home? Would you take care of your grandchildren? Often homes were multi-generational; if a man had several wives, they often lived in one home; longhouses were often the norm. The strength of the extended family is demonstrated in that it is still that ideal today. If the extended family survives even after colonialism, then this is a great marker that the society is matrilineal.
- Extended families help each other. The reality – and why governments tend to abolish them – is that extended families are harder to control. See Meyer, *The Child and the State*, for this insight.

- There is a ranking among the women within the clan – clan mothers are more important than other mothers, for example – and old people more important than the younger ones. Look at the role of grandmother.
- Rituals ask for the participation of men and women, and sometimes other genders.
- Another set of features surround the attitude towards women's power. Women are as mobile as men – they are in action. In particular, look at the role of women after menopause. Yes, you might have a society that is very restrictive for women during their puberty and their menstruations. At the same time, women are a reference point. Men are essentially considered like menopausal women.
- Women are involved in governance and leadership – either today, in the stories, or in the myths, women are as mobile as men and as vocal even on the public scene. "When the women speak, we shake." Women as chiefs or 'sachems', as diplomats, as warriors, as traders.
- Joy of women in going back to the land. Women can move across the land and see it as their world. In foraging societies, women are in the woods as much as the men. They have fewer weapons, however, and tend to communicate with animals; there is power in communication. In some societies, women are as involved in hunting as the men. In horticultural societies, women are the main food producers and they control the product of their farming. Compare this with the sense of domesticity that is very strong in Mediterranean societies, or Islamic societies, where women are at home and work for men while men are outside in the public sphere.
- Women are part of the communication network and information circulates between both sexes
- Leadership is not concentrated exclusively on one gender. Shared power was the norm. If one got too powerful, one was replaced.

Topics for further research:
* whether people in matricultures tend not to see things in universal or absolute terms but rather in relational terms – these are more complex, diversified, varied, and filled with nuances.

* attitudes in matricultural systems toward other genders

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE WORKSHOP

What is next? We agreed that Interculture will support Indigenous colleagues through the academic world. We all agreed on maintaining connections and communication channels open. We are going to explore possibilities to attend conferences, meetings and events allowing us to pursue the questions we have raised here. InterCulture is headed toward a symposium and a website allowing our networking joining groups on other continents. We had decided that the needed critical review of data and theories has to rely on ethnographic and ethnohistorical

data, and that the research process should respect the specific situation of each cultural community rather than engaging into generalizations. We are definitely not aiming for a pan-Indian perspective.

Moreover, our agenda has to engage into an active witnessing of what is happening in the contemporary Indigenous world as people reclaim and adapt large segments of their cultural heritages.

And more thanks than can be expressed here to all the participants.

REFERENCES

Boyer, Yvonne, 'First Nations Women's Contributions to Culture and Community through Canadian Law', in *Restoring the Balance. First Nations Women, Community and Culture*, edited by Gail Guthrie Valaskakis, Madeline Dion, and Eric Guimond (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2009), pp. 69-96.

Cruikshank, Julie, *Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination* (Vancouver: UBC Press; Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005).

Brumbach, Etty Jo and Robert Jarvenpa, 'Woman the Hunter: ethnoarchaeological lessons from Chipewyan life-Cycle dynamics', in *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*, edited by Cheryl Claassen and Rosemary A. Joyce (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), pp. 17-32; reprint in *In the Days of our Grandmothers: a reader in Aboriginal women's history in Canada*, edited by Mary-Ellen Kelm and Lorna Townsend (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), pp. 200-15.

Desray, Fabienne, « Nicole Claude MATHIEU (dir.), *Une maison sans fille est une maison morte. La personne et le genre en sociétés matrilinéaires et/ou uxorilocales* », *Clio. Femmes, Genre, Histoire* [En ligne], 32 |2010, mis en ligne le 31 décembre 2010, consulté le 19 septembre 2019. URL: http://journals.openedition.org/clio/9988.

Guédon, Marie-Françoise, 'Matrilinear Societies or Matrilinear Cultures', presentation at the annual meeting of the Canadian Anthropological Society – La Société Canadienne d'Anthropologie, May 2013, Victoria, BC.

Klein, Laura F. and Lillian A. Ackerman, eds., *Women and Power in Native North America* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995).

Leacock, Eleanor, *The Montagnais 'Hunting Territory' and the Fur Trade*, Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association 78, The American anthropologist N.S. 56 (1954), no. 8, pt. 2 (Menasha, Md: American Anthropological Association, 1954).

– 'Women's Status in Egalitarian Society: Implications for Social Evolution,' in *Current Anthropology*, vol. 33, no. 1, Supplement: *Inquiry and Debate in the Human Sciences: Contributions from Current Anthropology, 1960–1990*, pp. 225-59; essay originally appeared in *Current Anthropology*, vol. 19, no. 2 (Jun., 1978), submitted in final form September 10, 1977, and based on paper originally given at annual meeting, American Anthropological Association (Nov. 1974).

Mathieu, Nicole-Claude, ed., *Une maison sans fille est une maison morte. La personne et le genre en sociétés matrilinéaires et/ou uxorilocales* (Paris : Édition de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 2007).

Meyer, Philippe, *L'Enfant et la raison d'Etat* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977); translated under the title *The Child and the State* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984).

Sanday, Peggy Reeves, 'The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape: A Cross-Cultural Study,' *Journal of*

Social Issues, Vol. 37, No. 4 (1981), https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1981.tb01068.x pp. 5-27.

– *Women at the Center: Life in a modern Matriarchy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002).

Sanday, Peggy Reeves, and Ruth Gallagher Goodenough, eds., *Beyond the Second Sex: new directions in the anthropology of gender* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990).

Schneider, David Murray, and Kathleen Gough, *Matrilineal Kinship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

Sioui, Georges, *Eatenonha: native roots of modern democracy* (Montreal, Kingston, London, Chicago: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2019).

Tillion, Germain, *Le harem et les cousins* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966).

Valaskakis, Gail Guthrie, Madeline Dion Stout, and Eric Guimond, eds., *Restoring the Balance: First Nations Women, Community, and Culture* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2009).

Wiener, Annette B., *Women of value, men of renown: new perspectives in Trobriand exchange* (St. Lucia, Q: University of Queensland Press, 1977).

APPENDIX A

NATIVE WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

L'ASSOCIATION DES FEMMES AUTOCHTONES DU CANADA

"Over the generations, they have done everything": Indigenous Women and Matrilineality

Discussion Paper

From Matrilineal Kinship to Matriculture: Establishing a Canadian Agenda

25-28 April 2017, University of Ottawa

Prepared by NWAC's Justice and Human Rights Policy Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT NWAC 2

Introduction 3

Matrilineality Across Turtle Island 5

Knowledge Ownership 9

Conclusion and Discussion Questions 11

Works Cited 12

Appendix A – Further Reading 13

ABOUT NWAC

The Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC) is a national non-profit Indigenous organization representing the political voice of Indigenous women throughout Canada. It was incorporated in 1974 as a result of the activities of local and regional grassroots Native women's associations over many years. NWAC was formed to promote the wellbeing of Indigenous women within Indigenous and Canadian societies, and we focus our efforts on helping women overcome sex-based discrimination.

Today, NWAC engages in national advocacy measures aimed at legislative and policy reforms that promote equality for Indigenous women and girls. Through advocacy, policy, and legislative analysis, we work to preserve Indigenous culture, advance the wellbeing of Indigenous women and girls, as well as their families and communities.

NWAC is actively committed to raising the national and international profile on many issues specific to Indigenous women, including violence against women, the overrepresentation of women in prison, poverty, and ongoing sexual exploitation and trafficking of women and girls, along with the many other violations to Indigenous women's basic human rights. As a leader both domestically and on the international stage, NWAC works to improve the human rights of Indigenous women and remains dedicated to promoting gender equality through research, policy, programs, and practice.

INTRODUCTION

Mainstream feminism has been well-critiqued for not reflecting the lived realities of non-white, non-cisgendered women, especially when those lives are complicated by colonial violence.[1] Such thought additionally has a troubling history of conflating the experiences of all non-white women.[2] In articulating the intricacies of living at the intersection of multiple forms of discrimination, Mohawk scholar Patricia Monture writes:

> If I am the object of some form of discrimination, it is very difficult for me to separate what happens to me because of my gender and what happens to me because of my race and culture. My world is not experienced in a linear and compartmentalized way. I experience the world simultaneously as Mohawk and as woman.[3]

It is for this reason that NWAC applies an intersectional and decidedly Indigenous[4] feminist lens to its policy development and advocacy work. If feminism provides us with the tools to analyze "how social systems work to privilege men and disadvantage women",[5] then Indigenous feminism 1) roots itself in an Indigenous understanding of balanced gender roles rather than a European/ patriarchal understanding of hierarchical gender roles; and 2) analyzes racial and colonial oppression in conjunction with patriarchy. As Cree scholar Verna St. Denis notes,

> Colonization has involved the appropriation of sovereignty, lands, resources and agency, and has included the imposition of western and Christian patriarchy on Aboriginal peoples. Patriarchy is not the only form of oppression experienced by Aboriginal people, but it is certainly a part of that oppression.[6]

Among and within Indigenous communities, the impacts of the imposition of this colonial patriarchy–and, by extension, the disruption of matrilineality–has been well-documented.

---

[1] See Joyce Green, *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (2007); Grace Oulette, *The fourth world: An Indigenous perspective on feminism and Aboriginal women's activism* (2002): Patricia Monture-Angus, *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks* (1995)

[2] Patricia Monture, "The Roles and Responsibilities of Aboriginal Women: Reclaiming Justice" (1992), *Saskatchewan Law Review*, 246.

[3] Monture-Angus, 178.

[4] Generally speaking, we use the term "Indigenous" except when sources use the terms "Aboriginal", "First Nations", or "Native". Wherever possible, we refer to specific nations.

[5] Emma Larocque, "Metis and Feminist" in *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007), 57.

[6] Verna St. Denis, "Feminism is For Everybody" in *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007) 46.

Given the pernicious misconception that all Indigenous thought is identical, as well as the historical and ongoing silencing of Indigenous voices within academia, this paper will synthesize the writings of Indigenous women from the Eastern, Central, and Western areas of what is now known as Canada. Through their writings, we can see that while there are common threads of thought on matrilineality that can be traced through Indigenous and First Nations thinking, it is not necessarily a universal or blanket notion that can be applied across all Indigenous cultures. Rather, it contains multitudes of ideas and responsibilities that vary from nation to nation.

As everyone in this room is likely aware, Indigenous women are disproportionately discriminated against in a number of ways, but perhaps most notably in the ***Indian Act***. Status provisions and other colonial governance impositions have left Indigenous women vulnerable to legal discrimination, for example, in the case of matrimonial real property. The ***Indian Act*** does not contain provisions governing on-reserve "matrimonial real property", which is a term that includes a couple's home or land that they live on, or benefit from, during their marriage or marital relationship. In 1986, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that provincial and territorial laws on matrimonial real property do not apply to reserve land. These decisions created a gap in the law which has had serious consequences, especially for Indigenous women who are often not recognized as owners of property, contrary to traditional teachings and practices. Today, legislation has been passed that allows First Nations to develop their own laws around matrimonial real property, opening doors for equal distribution among women and men. This is just one instance in which matrilineality has been interrupted by colonial state policy.

It is worth noting that the history of matrilineal relationships of Indigenous women in Canada is an oral and living history, and much of what is presented in this paper is not documented in a traditional academic sense. Works listed in our Works Cited and in ***Appendix A*** should be consulted for a deeper understanding of traditional epistemologies and cosmologies which cannot be wholly represented in one discussion paper, but are rather a way of life that takes time and a lived experience to understand. As such, the final section of this paper contains a short discussion of the pitfalls of academic knowledge-gathering and emphasizes the fact that this knowledge belongs to Indigenous women and communities.

MATRILINEALITY ACROSS TURTLE ISLAND[7]

In articulating their understandings and lived experiences of matrilineality, First Nations women emphasize different aspects of its importance within their communities. However, across writings from Eastern, Central, and Western First Nations cultures, women are consistently positioned as knowledge carriers and political leaders, and colonial patriarchy is consistently framed as having disrupted these important roles. From a theoretical perspective, the writers cited below allow us to move beyond ethnography to explore the connections between Indigenous women, history, gendered politics, and narratives of identity. Collectively, they fill a gap that academic research cannot attend to, where Indigenous women's voices are at the center of traditional knowledge. This serves to highlight an important component of this discussion: the voices, stories, and organizing of Indigenous women and Elders must be the central source of defining and revitalizing traditional matrilineal societal systems.

Beginning in the East, Dr. Marie Anne Battiste (Mi'kmaq) urges caution when discussing gender roles in relation to matrilineal Mi'kmaq society, given that the idea of gender[8] is an import of European settlers, and as such is "a strained thought to the Mi'kmaq worldview".[9] She goes on to write that

> The predetermined natural fact of being created by the Holy Spirit as either a woman or man is of minor importance in the Mi'kmaq worldview. More important to the Mi'kmaq is the fate of being born into a tribal community which contributes to a shared mental experience: the sense of having a view of the world and of the good in which others participate.[10]

Unlike Mi'kmaq society, European society at the time of contact was intensely hierarchical and divided by an understanding of gender that directly contradicts this worldview and, indeed, much of Indigenous thought. Expanding on this, Battiste writes that

> Mi'kmaq concepts do not divide man from woman; the concepts only honour their ordinary efforts as mothers, grandmothers, godmothers, teachers, healers and the like. European thought calls them 'roles.' Mi'kmaq thought labels them extraordinary honours.[11]

---

[7] In an attempt to represent a cross section of First Nations thought on matrilineality, this section relies on writings by Mi'kmaq (Eastern), Mohawk (Central), Cree (Central/Western), and Salish (Western) women. Other matrilineal First Nations communities include the Huron, Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, Kwatkuitl, Tsimshian, Sioux, Navajo, Hopi, and Zuni (See Kirkness, 1988)

[8] Note the distinction between biological sex and the social construct of gender, which labels certain behaviours, attitudes, and/or ways of living as either "feminine" or "masculine"

[9] Dr. Marie Anne Battiste. "Mikmaq Women: Their Special Dialogue" (1989) *Canadian Women's Studies* 10:2-3, 61.

[10] Ibid at 61

[11] Ibid at 61

From Battiste's writing, we can delineate that in Mi'kmaq culture, these "roles" were not denigrated or considered subordinate to male roles. Indigenous women writers from across Turtle Island echo some of these same themes in their writings about women's roles in matrilineal communities, while teasing out the nuances of these roles within their communities. Lee Maracle (Salish), for example, emphasizes women's roles as storytellers in both her fiction and nonfiction work. Maracle argues that understanding how First Nations women's roles have changed through the years requires an understanding of colonialism as a lived reality in every Indigenous woman's life.[12]

Comparatively, Battiste delves more into Mi'kmaq women's roles as spiritual leaders, knowledge keepers, and social actors:

> In the traditional Mi'kmaq worldview, Mi'kmaq "woman" and "man" are the fulfillment of each other. Most of women's undivided obligations are held in common with their male partners. But Mi'kmaq thought teaches of special obligations which "women" have to the Holy Spirit. Mi'kmaq "women" are the keepers of the unknown. They have the ability to see the ordinary with amazement and to create the future.[13]

Similarly tying women's roles to spirituality, Verna Kirkness (Cree) attributes the change in the traditional roles of Native women in large part to the imposition of Christianity on Indigenous spirituality.[14] Kirkness expands on what was lost when the connection between women and spirituality was severed, writing that the imposition of Western governance systems–which took deciding power away from women– toppled the spiritual balance between men and women that existed before colonial invasion. For Kirkness, matrilineal relationships are characterized by a balance between women and men, where "the female was created simultaneously with the male, neither was accorded supremacy, and each was made dependent upon the other for existence".[15] This notion not of eliminating gender roles but of balancing them is central to First Nations worldview and is one of the ways in which Indigenous feminist thought conflicts with mainstream feminist thought, which frames all gender roles as a symptom of patriarchal oppression.

Both Kirkness and Maracle position women as the gatekeepers of culture and tradition, and position them as responsible for passing that culture, tradition, and language on to future generations, as well as

---

[12] Lee Maracle, *Daughters are Forever,* 2002, 123.
[13] Battiste, 61.
[14] Verna Kirkness, "Emerging Native Woman" (1987), *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law*,410.
[15] Kirkness, 409

being crucial to balanced governance. In ***Daughters are Forever***, Maracle argues that the political stability of First Nations communities is inextricably tied to respect for women and their safety, writing that First Nations governance systems are traditionally "rooted in the goodwill of safe womanhood".[16] A central component to the imposition of colonial patriarchy, which positions women as subordinate to men, has been the disruption of these roles. Kirkness writes that, unlike European societies, "traditional Native societies are examples of democracies in which all people were accorded equal rights".[17]

Battiste closes her piece by noting that it is precisely because of Western modernization and individualism that the fight for equal rights between and among genders is necessary, but within a society such as the Mi'kmaq one--where collective balance is more valued than individual ambition--the fight for gender equality does not resonate the same way, and in fact, could prove detrimental:

> In the restless individualist society of Canada, the equalization of gender is a necessary task in creating a better society. In the restoration of Mi'kmaq thought, an unreflective notion of gender could be merely another means of dividing our tribal society.[18]

As illustrated above, the impacts of the imposition of colonial patriarchy–and, by extension, the disruption of matrilineality–has been well-documented among and within First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities. Kim Anderson (Cree/Métis) and Bonita Lawrence (Mi'kmaq) argue that the imposition of this foreign gender division has resulted in "different definitions, among men and women, of 'sovereignty' and 'nationhood'",[19] and, in turn, women have been actively left out of consultations and policy development by the men in their communities.

Anderson and Lawrence trace this exclusion back to early settler-colonial interactions when colonial governments "actively disempowered [Indigenous] women" by refusing negotiate with them present, "accepting only male representatives when discussing [the] terms of [the] relationship",[20] despite the fact that governance and leadership responsibilities typically fell equally between men and women. State representatives additionally "[attacked] the clan system and other forms of female representation, by making it illegal for Indian women in Canada to take part in the band councils that replaced

---

[16] Maracle, 13
[17] Kirkness, 411
[18] Battiste, 63
[19] Kim Anderson and Bonita Lawrence, "Introduction to 'Indigenous Women: The State of Our Nations'" (2005) *Atlantis* 29:2 at 1.
[20] Ibid at 1

traditional Indigenous governments".[21] This, in turn, "has set the stage for a political representation that is not shaped by women's ways of knowing the world".[22] Excluding women to this extent has meant that "gendered struggles against colonialism have all too frequently been reduced to 'women's issues' by the formal male [Indigenous] leadership".[23]

[21] Ibid at 1
[22] Ibid at 1
[23] Ibid at 2

KNOWLEDGE OWNERSHIP

> *It is surely difficult to discuss research methodology and indigenous peoples together, in the same breath, without having an analysis of imperialism, without understanding the complex ways in which the pursuit of knowledge is deeply embedded in the multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices.* (Tuhiwai Smith, 2013, p. 2)

As outlined above, individual nations define for themselves what matrilineality looks like within their communities and why it is important. In discussing matrilineality, and the usefulness of "matriculture" as a theoretical concept, it is imperative to draw on the work and words of Indigenous women in order to avoid discursively reproducing colonial knowledge and power hierarchies. This is particularly salient in an academic context; Western academia has a long and troubled history of harmful and extractionary practices in the name of accumulating knowledge.[24] Fanon, Foucault, Derrida, Said, and other postmodern and postcolonial theorists would certainly not be out of place in this (or any) discussion of how power operates through discourse. However, Maori author Linda Tuhiwai Smith writes that historical silencing of Indigenous voices in academic research calls for an approach that "privileges the Indigenous presence and acknowledges the continuing existence of Indigenous peoples",[25] so we have aimed to do that here.

Patricia Monture (Mohawk) notes that individuals of Aboriginal ancestry who try to speak in both the academic world and the Aboriginal world are confronted by the profound cultural differences in the ways in which truth, knowledge and wisdom are constructed, including the notion that introspection is not typically considered a proper research method within Western institutions.[26] Simultaneously and contradictorily, Aboriginal academics are frequently asked to explain their unique cultural ways of being in a way that is comprehensible to Western thought. These contradictions exist in the way that knowledge and truth are constructed and sanctioned in each culture and Western institution. Bonita Lawrence echoes this claim, adding that

---

[24] See Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Research Methodologies* (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2013)
[25] Ibid at 6
[26] Patricia Monture, "The Roles and Responsibilities of Aboriginal Women: Reclaiming Justice" (1992) 56 Saskatchewan Law Review 237 at 240 [*Roles and Responsibilities*].

> A crucial part of the silencing of Indigenous voices is the demand that Indigenous scholars attempting to write about their histories conform to academic discourses that have already staked a claim to expertise about our pasts--notably anthropology and history.[27]

In ***Decolonizing Methodologies***, Tuhiwai Smith writes that, for colonized peoples "the term 'research' is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism",[28] and that to discuss research methods alongside Indigenous peoples necessarily means discussing imperialism.[29] Her work recounts the ways in which research on Indigenous peoples by colonial states and institutions has historically been infinitely harmful to those peoples but eminently useful to the colonizer in that research is what legitimizes the colonizer's policies, and policies are what define and restrict Indigenous lives.[30] The Cree/Métis writer Emma LaRocque similarly takes up this notion in ***When the Other Is Me***,wherein she traces the history of Indigenous resistance in Canada as being inextricably tied to rewriting national colonial discourses, including academic ones.

[27] ~~Bonita Lawrence, "Rewriting Histories~~ of the Land" in *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society* (Toronto: Between The Lines, 2002)
[28] Lawrence at 1
[29] Ibid at 2
[30] Ibid at 2

CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Indigenous matrilineal cultures have survived in spite of colonial (and, often, academic) disruption and intervention. For this reason, we must emphasize the importance of thinking about this community configuration from an Indigenous understanding of womanhood/ woman-ness; this paper has attempted to present such an understanding from a few different First Nations perspectives. While we did not examine thought and writing about and by other Indigenous groups such as Métis or Inuit in this presentation, those perspectives do certainly exist. The discussion questions below are designed to ensure any work on matrilineality is accountable to the Indigenous women directly impacted, and to whom this knowledge belongs.

Discussion Questions

- Given that the First Nations understanding of gender is, generally speaking, neither hierarchical nor binary, how does the "matricultural" classification help us understand First Nations issues and communities any better?
- How can we have these conversations in a way that is ethical and decolonized, and that privileges the needs and voices of Indigenous women, rather than knowledge accumulation for its own sake?
    - Relatedly: What does the theoretical delineation of the idea of "matriculture" do to ensure the survival of Indigenous matrilineal communities? How can this be measured?

WORKS CITED

Anderson, Kim and Lawrence, Bonita. “Introduction to ‘Indigenous Women: The State of Our Nations’” (2005) *Atlantis* 29:2.

Battiste, Dr. Marie Anne. “Mikmaq Women: Their Special Dialogue” (1989) *Canadian Women’s Studies* 10:2-3.

Kirkness, Verna. “Emerging Native Woman” (1987) *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law* 2(2), 408-415.

LaRocque, Emma. “Métis and Feminist” in *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007), 53-70.

LaRocque, Emma. *When the Other is Me: Native Resistance Discourse, 1850-1990* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010)

Monture-Agnus, Patricia. *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1995), 178.

Monture, Patricia. “The Roles and Responsibilities of Aboriginal Women: Reclaiming Justice” (1992) 56 Saskatchewan Law Review 237 at 240 *Roles and Responsibilities*].

St. Denis, Verna. “Feminism is For Everybody” in *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*, Ed. Joyce Green (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007)

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*,(Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2013)

APPENDIX A - FURTHER READING

Kim Anderson and Bonita Lawrence, *Strong Women Stories: Native Vision and Community Survival* (2003)

Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (2011)

Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping our Nations* (2013)

Bonita Lawrence, *"Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood* (2003)

Eden Robinson, *The Sasquatch At Home: Traditional Protocols and Modern Storytelling* (2011)

Lee Maracle, *I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism* (2003)

Leslie Marmon Silko, *The Turquoise Ledge: A Memoir* (2010)

Audra Simpson & Andrea Smith (eds.), *Theorizing Native Studies* (2014)

Cheryl Suzack, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, Jean Barman (eds.) *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture* (2011)

Volume 01, Issue I May 2020 Pg. 89 - 117

Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies

https://www.networkonculture.ca/activities/matrix

Matriculturality and the Algonquian Language Family: An Interim Report, May 2020

MARIE-FRANÇOISE GUÉDON, PhD

Abstract

As the notions of matrilineal kinship and matriarchy are becoming popular again, in both the public at large and Indigenous societies, it is important to trace the scholarly context in which these notions became meaningful. During the second half of the twentieth century, patrilineal descent used to be considered the most usual state of affairs for all human communities (47% of the world societies) ranging from small bands of hunter-gatherers to sedentary tribes to state societies, with bilateral systems (as in Europe) as the second most common type of kinship. Matrilineality, which is much less common (18% of the world societies, mostly Indigenous), used to be explained away as a result of special circumstances giving women the control of food production, mostly as horticulturalists, while men are engaged in other pursuits away from home.

These views have shaped the development of kinship studies in North America, influenced the ways in which North American Indigenous people have been described, and informed governmental policies. But they have since been challenged; and other perspectives are emerging, including a potential connection between language and the development of a strong matricultural cultural context able to sustain matrilineal lineages. Such a connection has been noticed in the case of Indigenous North America; matrilineal and patrilineal systems are each found in different linguistic families, so one can predict the likelihood of a community being matrilineal simply by the linguistic family to which it belongs. However, the Algonquian and the Siouan linguistic families seem not to follow the others in that they are split between matrilineal, patrilineal and bilateral descent systems. This discrepancy gives us the opportunity to re-examine the ways in which descent has been defined and then used to classify cultures. Part I of this report retraces anthropological theoretical stances and concepts leading to the present opposition between patrilineal and matrilineal systems, and the establishment of semi-official labels for Indigenous communities, and the increasingly separate work of the

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture. This is an Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

linguists on understanding the genetic connections between the Indigenous languages. Parts II and III, still to come, will examine the case of the Algonquians in more detail, bringing linguistics, archaeology and ethnology together, widening and deepening our ethnographical, ethno-historical and ethnological knowledge of the Algonquian kinship systems and the cultural context supporting their matriculture, including social organization and worldviews.

Résumé
Alors que les notions de systèmes de parenté matrilinéaire et de matriarchat refont surface dans le grand public et dans les sociétés autochtones, il est intéressant de retracer le contexte savant qui a permis au cours des deux derniers siècles l'établissement des études de parenté qui ont contribué les concepts dont nous nous servons aujourd'hui. Les systèmes patrilinéaires ont longtemps été considérés comme dominants et ordinaires dans l'organisation sociale des sociétés humaines (47% des sociétés du monde), avec, au deuxième rang, les systèmes bilatéraux (en Europe, entre autre). Les systèmes matrilinéaires, bien plus rares (18% des société du monde, presque toujours autochtones) furent longtemps vus soit comme un reliquat des temps archaïques, soit comme le résultat de circonstances particulières, le plus souvent en lien avec l'horticulture, donnant aux femmes le contrôle de la production de la nourriture pendant que les hommes étaient engagés dans des activité prenant place loin de la communauté.

Ces théories ont informé le développement des études de parenté en Amérique du Nord et contribué à la façon dont les peuples indigènes on été décrits, ainsi qu'au développement des politiques gouvernementales les concernant. Ces théories ont pourtant été contestées, et parmi les perspectives différentes, la possibilité d'une connexion entre la langue et la nature patrilinéaire ou matrilinéaire des systèmes de lignages et de clan fait l'objet du projet présenté ici. Dans le cas de l'Amérique du Nord, il est possible de prédire la présence de systèmes soit matrilinéaires, soit patrilinéaire à partir de l'appartenance à certaines familles linguistiques. Deux exceptions majeures, la grande famille des Algonquiens, et celle des Siouans, sont chacune divisées entre plusieurs modes de transmission parentale. Ces exceptions nous offrent l'opportunité de réexaminer les termes usuels définissant les systèmes unilinéaires et bilatéraux, ainsi que leur utilisation par les ethnologues.
La première partie de ce rapport retrace les attitudes anthropologiques qui ont mené à l'opposition entre matrilinéaire et patrilinéaire, d'une part, et d'autre part, au divorce méthodologique entre études de parenté et linguistique. Les deuxième et troisième parties (à venir) présentera plus en détail le cas des peuples de langues algonquiennes, en réunissant linguistique, archéologie et ethnologie pour reconstruire les systèmes matriculturels des peuples en question.

This interim report is part of an invitation addressed to members of matricultural communities and to interested researchers, especially those with links to North American Indigenous communities (see *Introduction*). I invite you to join the team that supports the research process described

herein, or to take the underlying questions and hypotheses and make them your own, so as to further the debate.

Prologue[1]

In 1977, Sandra Lovelace, a Wolastoqi (Maliseet/Malecite) woman on the Tobique reserve in Canada, brought a case of discrimination to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR; then known as the UN Human Rights Committee) in what is known as the case of Lovelace v. Canada. This case was about the fact that Canadian Indigenous women lost their official Indian Status when they married a white man, though Indigenous men could marry white women without losing their status. While not addressing her case directly, in 1981 the UNCHR found *inter alia* Canada to be in breach of Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Canada still has to completely comply with this ruling;[2] see Lynn Gehl, 2013 and 2017, for a review of the case and its consequences.

During the proceedings, the Canadian federal government argued that in order to protect the land rights of Indigenous communities, the Indian Act at its inception took into account "the fact that patrilineal family relationships [...] were traditionally used as a basis for determining legal claims."[3] For this reason and others, the act provided that an Indian woman who married a non-Indian man would lose her status and land rights (see Boyer, 2009)[4]. As acknowledged in the final decision adopted by the UNCHR, the contention that legal relationships within Indian families were traditionally patrilineal was disputed by Sandra Lovelace in her submission of 20 June 1980 to the UNCHR; it also includes a letter drafted on her behalf by her counsel, Donald Fleming, which states:

> The government of Canada implies that Indian families were traditionally patrilineal in nature, when such is – or, at least – was not necessarily the case; many Indian

1 This is a revised version of the Prologue, corrected on 3 August 2020; see the original version at the end of the text. My thanks to Lynn Gehl, who pointed out the missing references for the first paragraph, and the error in the text that should have recognized the fact that the UNCHR did not rule in favor of Sandra Lovelace, but, rather, ruled against Canada and the Indian Act.

2 For a complete review of the case, and the consequences for children whose father is not specifically identified as an Indigenous man on their birth certificate, see: Lynn Gehl (2013), 'Indian Rights for Indian Babies: Canada's "Unstated Paternity" Policy,' *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 8(2), 54-73. Retrieved from https://fpcfr.com/index.php/FPCFR/article/view/187*;* accessed 28 July 2020. See also Lynn Gehl (2017), 'Ontario's History of Tampering and Re-Tampering with Birth Registration Forms,' *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 12(1), 24-33. Retrieved *from* https://fpcfr.com/index.php/FPCFR/article/view/311; accessed 28 July 2020.

3 The relevant content reads in full: "In what was then a basically farming economy, it was considered that Indian reserve lands were more threatened by non-Indian men than by non-Indian women. *This, together with the fact that patrilineal family relationships, rather than blood quantum (measure of Indian ancestry), were traditionally used as a basis for determining legal claims*, led to the introduction, in 1869, of the first legislative provisions dealing with the status of Indian women who married non-Indian men." (emphasis mine) Retrieved from https://indigenouslaw.usask.ca/documents/publications/lovelace/Lovelace_doc13.pdf, pp. 2-3; accessed 28 July 2020.

4 Yvonne Boyer (2009), 'First Nations Women's Contributions to Culture and Community through Canadian Law,' in *Restoring the Balance. First Nations Women, Community and Culture*, Gail Guthrie Valaskakis, Madeline Dion, and Eric Guimond, editors, University of Manitoba Press, pp. 69-96.

> communities were matrilineal in nature, and the Indian Act has successfully destroyed that aspect of their culture.[5]

The statement by the federal government of Canada directly contradicted the presence, known by members of their communities and recognized by anthropologists, among others, of matrilineal systems among the Canadian Iroquoian peoples, as well as the Tsimshian, Haida, and Tlingit peoples on the Northwest Coast, and half the Northern Athapaskan, among other First Nations. It also imposed an official patrilineal status on all the Algonquian speakers, the largest linguistic family group of all Indigenous people in Canada, from the Blackfoot (Siksika) in the western Plains to the Anishinaabeg and Cree in central and eastern Canada, to the Mi'kmaq and Maliseet on the Atlantic Coast, among other peoples. In view of the fact that half of the Algonquian speaking community in the USA were known to have been not patrilineal, are the Canadian Algonquians really patrilineal? More specifically, given the anthropological references to matrilineality and patrilineality, and the use of linguistic affiliations to identify indigenous communities, what contributions could anthropologists have brought to the issue?

Introduction to Part 1

This study examines the potential link between language and kinship systems (specifically, descent systems in Indigenous North America) as one unexplored but puzzling aspect of the distribution of kinship features in Indigenous North America.[6] Can what is shared by people who speak the same language lead to similar forms of matriculture?

Part 1 of this study aims to define the contemporary frame of reference for kinship research, the same frame that has informed administrators and their policies, and that has been transmitted in Anthropology and Native Studies textbooks. This frame of reference is best reflected in the concepts or terms we use and in their definition, which are listed below. These terms represent our best achievement to date as anthropologists and, at the same time, the limits of our shared understanding. In the same way as kin terms and explicit codes of descent inform a society, these terms of reference inform our scholarly forays into kinship studies, gender relations, and native studies.

Part 2 of this project, still to come, will focus on patterns of descent in the Algonquian language family in interaction with individual Algonquian languages, and test our understanding of descent systems. The resulting interaction between the Algonquian world, as conveyed by Algonquian languages and kinship patterns, and the scholarly language will, we hope, result in new

5 Lovelace, Sandra, Noël A. Kinsella, and Donald Fleming, 'Section III: Information and Observations Concerning the Rationale of the Government of Canada for Not Amending Section (12) (1) (b) of the Indian Act, Part B: Formal Information and Observations Drafted on behalf of Mrs. Sandra Lovelace', in *Transmittal to U.N. of Lovelace's Submission Concerning the Communication and the Arguments Made by Canada in it's Submission (Document 14)*, p 11 of Part B (document p. 32) https://indigenouslaw.usask.ca/publications/sandra-lovelace-v.-canada-1977-1981.php, accessed 10 July 2020.

6 Please note: I am using the designations and terms for Indigenous groups as followed by current linguistic practice. I do so because the report is about linguistic affiliations, not about administrative divisions whether in English or in Indigenous languages. And the two systems do not match. However, since this research explores correlations between the kinship features of cultural systems and language families, using linguistic terms and understandings is the best option.

perspectives on what it is we are trying to understand, and what happens when we borrow alien concepts to approach Indigenous systems of thought. The process may confirm the terms we use or lead to a new set of terms and definitions.

In Part 3, also yet to come, we intend to widen and deepen our ethnographical, ethno-historical and ethnological knowledge of the Algonquian kinship systems, and gather information on the cultural context supporting their matriculture, including social organization and worldviews. This methodological shift toward matriculture also requires documenting the position and perspectives of women in these societies. Taking matriculture as our term of reference means looking for new data and questioning previous classifications, rather than flagging only identified matrilineal kinship and descent systems. The resulting new horizon may also allow us to test the methodological value of the concept of matriculture in anthropological theory and analytical practice.

Terms of reference in kinship studies

1. *Descent* refers to the transmission of social identity and status from one generation to the next. It comes in three main forms depending on the line of inheritance: In *bilateral descent*, one is related to both father's side and mother's side, and identifies relatives in the same way on each side; in *unilineal descent*, one is related primarily to kin on one side of the family, either on the mother's side – *matrilineal descent* – producing a matrilineal consanguineal kin group or matriline, or on the father's side – *patrilineal or agnatic descent*,– producing a patrilineal consanguineal kin group or patriline. *Matrilineality* means that people belong to their mother's kin group, take their mother's kin group name or family name, or inherit goods and social position from the mother's side. In contrast, in *patrilineal* societies, people belong to their father's kin group, take his kin group name or 'surname', or inherit goods and social position from the father's side. Unilineal descent groups can results in *lineages* (where one can trace back the common ancestor of the kin group), in *clans* (formerly identified as sib, when a common ancestor is assumed but no longer identified), in *phratries* (groups of clans), and *moieties* (when the community or society is divided in two halves, as in two sets of lineages, clans, or phratries), which are usually *exogamous*: one must find a spouse on the other side, or outside of one's group. The presence of unilineal kin groups does not mean that kin outside of the kin group are ignored, on the contrary; they frequently hold important and sometimes precise educative, ceremonial, or social roles in the life of their relatives that are not members of their own kin group. For instance, many matrilineal societies recognize special ritual prerogatives for the members of the father's kin group or for in-laws.

2. *Bilateral* descent systems, where kin ties are traced on both mother's and father's side, result in what is termed anthropologically as *kindred*, which is a kin group based on recruiting kin from both sides. Unlike unilineal groups, the boundaries of which are clearly traced and extend in time to allow the formation of corporate-like groups, kindreds are not descent groups with clear boundaries and cannot become corporate entities; kindreds are reckoned from the individual and extend in both directions, often including affines, which means that every individual in the group is the center of a different kindred.

3. Other forms of descent systems are much less frequent, if not rare. They include *bilineal descent* systems (*or double descent*) where both systems are combined (for instance, when names are transmitted via the mother's side and land is transmitted through the father's side), and *ambilineal descent* systems (where one chooses either one's father's side or one's mother's side, but not both, or when someone else selects the lineage or group to which one will belong). Even scarcer are systems of *parallel descent* whereby matrilines are favoured for women, patrilines for men, with one or two known cases of *alternating descent* where a girl belongs to her father's side, while a boy belongs to his mother's side.

3. *Post-marital residence rules* determine the residence of the new couple after marriage, and therefore the composition of local groups, from households to neighborhoods. As important as descent, as recognized by Murdock in 1955, who thought that matrilineality begins with or presupposes matrilocality, post-marital residence comes in various shapes and forms. *Patrilocality or virilocality* means the new couple is going to reside with or near the groom's parents. *Matrilocality* (when matrilineality is present, if one follows the terms recommended Murdock) or *uxorilocality* (in the absence of a lineage system) means that the new couple resides with or near the bride's parents. Many matrilineal societies, especially ranked societies, prefer *avunculoca*l residence, that is for the new couple to reside with or near the maternal uncle of the groom, who is often the husband of the bride's mother, that is the father of the bride, if cross-cousin unions are preferred. Other forms of marital residence include *bilocal residence* when the new couple moves alternately from the husband's to the wife's family home, and *duolocality* when husband and wife live separately, or *neolocality* when the new couple establishes their own residence in a new site. Post-marital residence can be definitive or temporary, for example, in the form of bride service. Sometimes, especially in a society with social inequality, the rich, powerful families will insist on one type of high status post-marital residence while the poorer families will allow the new couple to move into the residence that is economically most favorable, resulting in what is sometimes called "half-marriages" (as among the Pacific Northwest Athapaskan peoples, where the family of the leaders are patrilocal, while the rest of community is matrilocal.)

4. French anthropologist Nicole-Claude Mathieu, on the basis of data from Indigenous communities all over the world, proposed (among other things) to consider the local kin neighborhood resulting from matrilocality or uxorilocality as a kind of matrilineage or *minimal matrilineage*, to borrow the expression from John H. Moore. Indeed, many societies without lineages or clans function as if they had matrilineages when the means of subsistence (gardens, trap lines, fishing sites and so on), social identity, political titles, ceremonial or ritual functions are transmitted from a mother or a mother's brother to her children or to his nephew or niece. This establishes a kind of filiation in the absence of a unilineal kin group.

5. Several contemporary matrilineal societies occasionally refer to themselves as *matriarchal*, borrowing the term from the mid-nineteenth century when it referred to a semi-mythical state of society ruled by women. In its new inception, matriarchy is a term that defines governance and the participation of women in the governance or economy of their community. The distinction between matrilineal (having to do with kinship and descent) and matriarchal (having to do with governance) was best articulated by Peggy Reeves Sanday following her research among the

Minangkabau people of Sumatra (see Sanday's presentation at CASCA 2017, Ottawa). The existence of matriarchal societies that would be the mirror image of patriarchal societies (where women would be, as a gender, dominant, and men would be, as a gender, subservient) is doubtful. Anthropologists do not recognize any such type of society (although they do accept the notion of patriarchy). The societies that call themselves matriarchal today, such as the Iroquois (USA and Canada), the Ashanti (Ghana) or the Mosuo (China), define matriarchy not as the reverse or mirror image of the patriarchal systems, but as its antithesis. That is, these societies tend to define themselves as egalitarian, with both women and men exercising power and participating in leadership, including the exercise of economic and political authority, throughout the whole community. In many cases, this includes not only women as political leaders or landholders, but also as warriors or chief negotiators with outsiders, and as traders and producers of trading goods. We call these social features 'matriarchal features', and they can usually be found associated with matrilineality. Conversely, not all matrilineal societies share these features. Anthropologically speaking, patriarchy is not necessarily tied to patrilineality, but it is reinforced by patrillineal systems, and weakened by matrilineal succession.

6. In this report, the term *matriculture* defines the cultural context that recognizes the presence and participation of women in the cultural fabric of society, in both its weak and strong expressions. Matriculture may support, among other traits, matrilineality (and matrilineal kinship), matrilocality (living near the mother's home), matriarchy (women's participation in governance), or the socio-cultural expressions of these systems even in the absence of unilineal kin groups, lineages, clans, or moieties. Social organization does not stop at kinship systems; a large part of the social, economic, political, and religious structures of society are directly implicated in matriculture… One may therefore add to matriculture such aspects as gender definitions, women's freedom of action and mobility, their entrepreneurship, and the extent to which gender becomes an organizational factor in the community. It may also support matricentric (Georges Sioui) or *matrixial worldview* (see Peggy Reeves Sanday for a discussion of that term) and gendered or non-gendered cosmology. All this presupposes the participation of men in the matricultural system that defines men as much as it defines women, as sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers, but also as participants in governance and contributors to the cultural fabric of society. In all these senses, matriculture can be considered a cultural system in Geertz's classical articulation of the expression.

7. The term *worldview* refers to the ways in which the members of a society perceive, understand, and engage in the human society and the world in which they live, what used to be called intellectual culture.

Please note three conventions used in this study: a) The terminology used in the United States, which favors terms such as tribe and Indians, does not match corresponding Canadian use of terms like nation and Indigenous. The spelling of Indigenous names mostly follows Waldman, 1985. b) The terms 'culture' and 'tradition' in their archaeological usage, do not refer to the cultural context anthropologists and ethnologists understand as 'culture'. Instead they refer to the series of tools and material assemblages that define certain regions or certain periods recognizable in archaeological sites. c) When a tribe or groups is said to be 'officially patrilineal' or 'officially matrilineal', the term 'officially' refers to labels currently used either in administrative documents

or in the majority of atlases and textbooks. Unlike ethnographic studies, the official labels are extreme summaries that follow classifications which are themselves theoretical summaries of academic reports. They are often misleading and devoid of all nuance, and they matter especially when they are adopted by the Indigenous communities themselves and have become terms of reference for insiders.

1- *Kinship and Descent: A North American theoretical background*

Matrilineality and patrilineality emerged early in the history of anthropology as concepts tied both to the systematic observation of societies, and theories on the development of ancient societies. Patrilineality and patrilineal descent is practiced in 47% of the 857 societies in Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas (Murdock 1967); it is found in all parts of the world and in association with all forms of economic and political systems, and remains the dominant system in human societies. Matrilineality is present in only 18% of the world societies; matrilineal systems are extremely diverse and are scattered throughout the world. All but one or two are Indigenous people, with a large proportion of them to be found in Indigenous North America. The rest of the sample, acccording to Murdock, is identified mostly as bilateral systems with a few labeled as others.

From the mid-nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth century, serious anthropological debate was devoted to the development of unilineal kin groups, with many hypotheses offered. Patrilineal kin groups were seen as the 'natural' state for hunting-gathering societies; Julian Stewart (1938; 1955) saw them as best suited to the hunters' natural environment and technology, which he associated with small, nomadic or semi-nomadic, self sufficient and homogeneous groups or 'bands' (Steward 1955: 44), which corresponded to an simple 'level of socio-cultural integration' (see also Service 1962 for an emphasis on the patrilocal residence requirement for hunter-gatherers; and Sahlins 1961: 324). The idea of the patrilineal band as 'the simplest, most rudimentary form of social structure' (Service 1962: 107) affected most northern Canadian Indigenous societies since Stewart applied the term to both the northern Algonquians and the northern Athabascans, among others (see also Owen 1965: 676, and June Helm, 1986, for different discussions of the term).

In North America, matrilineal kin groups were usually explained as being the consequence of external conditions found mostly in horticultural societies, and, compared with foraging societies, at a higher 'level of socio-cultural integration', that of the tribal level. These conditions could foster a range of pressurizing forces from environmental necessity favoring the transmission of cultivated land though female kin, to military or economic demands resulting in men's absence from the home (See Murdock, 1949, 1955:55; Schneider and Gough, 1974). While such factors were presented as central to the formation of social systems, other perspectives, such as worldview orientations, were rarely considered and most theoretical approaches developed in the twentieth century saw values and ethics as a consequence of, rather than a factor in, the development of social systems.

The discussion around patrilineality and matrilineality belonged to a larger academic context, that of kinship studies, which was at the center of both British and North American anthropology during the second part of the twentieth century. While the mostly European (and, later, early

Marxist) idea of an archaic matriarchy - which still surfaces from time to time – disappeared from the official American academic scene, the assumptions of cultural evolutionists continued to inform early American approaches to Indigenous kinship, including research dealing with the reconstruction of early Indigenous kinship systems. (One of these assumptions is the idea that early hunter-gatherers lived a simple life in isolation, defined primarily by a quest for food and shelter; another is that foragers' bands are defined by the boundaries of the territory they exploit.)

However, George Peter Murdock introduced a new tool for kinship studies, i.e. statistics, when he began an ambitious project to expand his comparative research on descent systems and kinship terminology, as part of a larger research project on family and social organization. That is, in 1937 Murdock founded the Cross Cultural Survey in order to compile published ethnographic material. This first effort brought 90 cultures under scrutiny in a vast and growing database. Using a cross cultural analytical method to sort through and compare ethnographic data drawn from research all over the world (established so that it could be used by other social sciences as well), Murdock piloted a series of cross-cultural studies that focused on various aspects of social organization, including descent systems and kinship terminology and expanded his data base. The resulting publication in 1949 of his research informed by this new tool, *Social Structure* (Murdock, 1949), became an instant classic and a focal point for kinship studies. In order to increase the amount of available data towards the maximum, Murdock invited colleagues and universities to form a consortium that became the Human Relations Area Files [HRAF], headquartered in New Haven, Connecticut. This resulted in a listing of all known cultures, the *Outline of World Cultures*, published in 1954, and the *World Ethnographic Sample* (1957) where 565 cultures are coded for 30 variables, the *Ethnographic Atlas (1967),* and the *Atlas of World Cultures* (1981).

Meanwhile, in 1967 Murdock published a summary of his findings for Indigenous North America, linking types of descent systems with post-marital residence patterns and types of kin terminology, all amenable to statistical analyses. His reconstruction of kinship system development throughout history, based on measurable correlations, attracted considerable attention, the more so as several of his basic assumptions matched those discussed by the majority of his colleagues both in ethnology and archeology. For instance, Murdock's interpretation of the potential link between natural environment (or resources) and kinship systems also implies taking into account technology and the division of tasks. This interpretation can inform residence patterns according to a 'common sense' argument that accepts patrilineality as the 'normal' state of society (in agreement with Stewart). A matrilocal and locally exogamous marriage implies that a man leaves his own community for his wife's community. According to Murdock, this change causes a serious handicap in a man's activities:

> A woman can join her husband in another community and continue to carry on without handicap all the technical skills she has acquired since childhood. But a man who goes to a new community in matrilocal marriage has to master an entirely new environment. All the knowledge he has gained as a boy and youth concerning the location of trails and landmarks, of mineral deposits, of superior stands of timber, of haunts of game, and of the best grazing or fishing sites becomes largely useless, and must be painfully accumulated afresh for the new territory (Murdock 1949:213-14).

Murdock (1949, 1955, 1957, 1967) insisted on the double correlation between, on the one hand, hunting-gathering subsistence patterns and bilateral or patrilineal kinship systems and, on the other hand, between horticulture and matrilineality. His insistence was due to his statistical analyses showing matrilineal systems as more likely to occur in societies where women worked and owned the garden, while patrilineal systems predominated among hunters in areas where resources allowed for a sufficient population density and among agrarian or pastoralist subsistence patterns, where men owned the land and the herds. Murdock concluded:

> [Matrilineality is most likely] when the means of subsistence of a people depend primarily upon women's activities in the division of labor by sex. The conditions which most frequently lift her economic contribution to a level above that of a man is the introduction of agriculture into a society previously dependent upon hunting and gathering. Since agriculture is usually women's work, matrilocal residence and matrilineal descent tend to be particularly common among lower agricultural peoples (Murdock 1949: 205). (...) A contributory factor is the absence of movable property in herds, slaves, or other valuables; in the hands of the men these might challenge the re-eminence of landed property and introduce the destructive factor of polygyny. Relative peacefulness is another contributory factor, for war enhances the importance of men and often brings slaves wives or booty with which to purchase women. Still another significant precondition is a relatively low level of political integration, particularly one which, as in Melanesia and among the Pueblo Indians, does not extend beyond the local community. Wider political authority brings to the holders, who are almost invariably men, increased power, property and prestige, which often spell doom to the matrilocal principle (Murdock 1949:205-206).

In that scheme, matrilineal descent could still accommodate male power if the community develops avunculocality, so that groups of men are brought together around the mother's brother, or if it becomes patrilocal while retaining the matrilineal groups only as an exogamous unit, or, even more rarely, organizes around a double descent system.

Many ethnologists still agree with Murdock: The division of labor as defined by the subsistence patterns should strongly shape post-marital residence and one would derive 'rules of descent from rules of residence'. Matrilocality, therefore, should be a prerequisite to matrilineality. Murdock and his colleagues did not take into account the many obvious exceptions to the scheme he had proposed: The pastoralist Tuaregs are matrilineal; the hunting-gathering Pygmies in the Congo basin are matrilineal. In North America, and closer to the Algonquians, the climate and geography of the arctic or subarctic regions preclude the Indigenous development of horticulture or agriculture in the culture areas located in these regions, and should therefore prevent the development or maintenance of matrilineality among the northern hunters. Yet, a large proportion of the northern Athapaskan hunters in the western subarctic forest of North America are matrilineal. Either they are not really matrilineal, answers Murdock, or they have acquired their matrineal descent prior to their arrival in North America. This last hypothesis does not solve the

question since the Siberian forests are not supposed to encourage matriliny either (see Isidore Dyen and David Aberle, 1974: 373).

As a solution to the subarctic Athapaskan anomaly, Murdock and others proposed that northern matrilineal descent resulted from borrowing matrilineality from neighboring groups. Several studies demonstrated that this early hypothesis was invalid. First, David Aberle (1974) reconstructed the lexical aspects tying together the Athapaskan kinship systems from Central Alaska and Northern Canada all the way to the Southwestern Basin in the USA, confirming the ancient reality of matrilineality among the Western subarctic Athapaskans. And Frederica de Laguna, in her 1978 study of northwestern American clan systems, showed that the names of matrilineal clans and moieties had a well established antiquity in the north and could not be the result of diffusion from the Pacific Coast. Second, the reality of northern Athapaskan matrilineal clan systems coupled with fluidity of territorial occupation was confirmed by Nelson (1974) and Catherine McClellan (1987) in the the Yukon, June Helm in the Northwest territories (1986), and Hugh Brody (1981) in northern Alberta, as well as my own doctoral research looking at how a semi-nomadic hunting and foraging society living on the border between Alaska and Yukon could possibly maintain a matrilineal clan system. Third, men in a hunting-gathering society need not limit themselves to a small part of the land. It does not take many years for hunters to get to know the resources and rhythms of new hunting territories they have already visited, and the possibility for men to hunt both in their parent's hunting grounds and in their wife's territory doubles the amount of resources available to them. These semi-nomadic peoples are used to travelling far and wide. People – men, women, children and extended families- used to move from band to band and from camp to camp to visit relatives and benefit from different resources. In effect, both men and women could orient themselves within a vast territory. Finally, Guédon challenged the principle linking division of labor and types of unilineal descents on the basis of faulty conceptions of the division of labor among hunting and gathering economies (Guédon, 2016, 2017). The production of women's gathering activities has been remarkably under-evaluated by theorists; it always includes fishing and hunting or trapping small game, and among all Canadian northern groups, especially the Athapaskan and Cree, women also hunt big game once they are past menopause (see also Landes, 1938; Flannery, 1930; Bruhns and Stothert, 1999).

The case of Athaspascan matrilineality plays an explicit role in this argument because it most clearly challenges views so widely held. We now know that about 25% of matrilineal systems in the world are found amongst hunter-gatherer or nomadic societies, encompassing even Australian Aborigines, several southeastern Asian Indigenous societies, and equatorial African Pygmies, among others. Harold E. Driver's maps of North American culture element distributions, well-accepted classics, and Alfred Kroeber's mapping of cultural areas (Kroeber: 1939), among others, reveal no correlation whatsoever between matrilineal systems and climate, geographic environmental features, demographic patterns, or subsistence patterns.

Factors depending on geographical or environmental features may inflect but do not determine the presence or absence of matrilineal descent. Some researchers looked elsewhere for correlations, and discovered that the presence of matrilines or patrilines may be linked to different features of the social organization.

In his watershed 1925 study, *Distribution of Kinship Systems in North America*, Leslie Spier championed comparative kinship studies and concluded that several distinct features of kinship systems in North America are regularly associated with patrilineality, other features as associated with matrilineality. The matrilineal markers include: lineage, clan, or moiety exogamy, cross-cousin marriage, temporary or permanent matrilocality, kinship terminology tending toward the Iroquois system or the Crow system, a recognized role for the mother's brother's in bringing up children (he is sometimes recognized as the male head of the family), complementary social and ritual functions for the paternal side of the family, and, finally, a strong bond between brother and sister often marked by ritual avoidance and material support. It should be noted that these features vary enough between cultures to prevent a simple unifying definition of matrilineality (see also E.W. Gifford, 1940). Spier considered these traits as consequences of, rather than factors toward matrilineal descent. But he considered that their presence might indicate the lasting influence of a past matrilineal descent system. The clusters observed by Spier, and his students and colleagues were confirmed by Murdock, and provided clues for the reconstruction of the development of descent systems in the Americas.-

Several researchers challenged the orthodox view of kinship development and proposed to enlarge the debate, but one interesting *lacuna* of these studies is that, although they established correlations between features of social organization and descent systems for societies that were identified mostly though their linguistic affiliations, there was no attempt to regroup the findings according to linguistic connections, even when language was part of the methodological context.

Guy E. Swanson (1968, 1969) ventured to include values, as expressed in political regimes, in his own model of the genesis of descent systems. Swanson began with Schneider and Homans' conclusions that "…the kinship system occupies a unique place in any culture, since it is almost always the context within which most socialization takes place. […] The dominant values of the total culture must [therefore] find expression in the kinship system." (Schneider and Homans, 1955: 1208). Swanson asked: "What 'dominant values' are embodied in rules of descent? […] What values are embodied in matriliny, in patriliny? In bilateral descent?" (Swanson, 1969:4). He then developed his hypothesis as follows:

> Rules of descent express the characteristic form that is taken by processes through which a society fits men to participate in its organization and through which it maintains their fitness for participation across the whole span of their lives. These processes usually take the form of socialization or of social control or of some combination of these two. […] I mean by socialization the training of people to participate in their society with increasing skills and commitment. […] I mean by social control any influence exerted by a society on socialized persons to employ the skills they have learned and to support the commitment they have accepted, <u>this despite their personal tendencies not to do so</u>. [*the emphasis is mine*] (Swanson, 1969:5).

Swanson noted, along with most ethnologists that "…women are everywhere the chief socializers of the young. [..] They also have special responsibility for reintegrating dissident members of the

family […] the tasks of socialization." He also proposed that adult males have to lead the group, especially when dealing with divergent interests within the community, and exercise the necessary discipline which has primarily the character of social control (Swanson, 1969:5). He arrived at the following hypothesis:

> I propose that systems of descent symbolize the socialization or social control of a society's members – adults and children – by that society. […] Socialization is impeded, and social control made likely, to the extent that people can rightfully pursue special interests that compete or conflict with the interest of their society – with the 'common' interests. (Swanson, 1969: 7)

The final proposition, that 'matriliny expresses socialization as a style of parentage; patriliny expresses social control' (Swanson1969: 23) is actually verified by his statistical analyses (based on Murdock's samples) that demonstrate that matriliny is definitely found in societies organized politically toward the well being of the collectivity rather than toward the negotiation between divergent goals of subgroup which results in patriliny. In his review of Swanson's work, David Aberle agrees:

> Descent then is traced through the parent whose dealings with the child are in accordance with the essential characteristics of the political regime. Swanson finds it possible to show an association between political regimes and rules of descent that is far stronger than any so far found between other factors and rules of descent. (Dyen and Aberle, 1974:177)

At a general level, Swanson did not consider the genesis of the social values at work in the formation of political regimes and seemed to imply that the political system was the active factor in these correlations. Yet, it would have been interesting for Swanson to chart political systems using linguistic data in addition to historical considerations

Others could have followed a similar path. In 1965, Roger Owen published an article challenging the description of band societies, in particular their supposed homogeneity, arguing that the exogamous rule brought together a set of local men with sets of foreign women, as verified by several cases of multilingual small scale communities. In the course of his argument, he wrote:

> Two assumptions underlie the following presentation. First, I regard language as a means of conveying, amongst other things, a set of traditional, regionally oriented, adaptive symbols. The total matrix of the language is a device whereby one generation passes to another the knowledge, values, attitudes, and techniques necessary to cope with the total environment wherein it has been traditionally located. Second, I regard "culture," or better "a culture," as a complex of traditionally derived adaptive symbols - including, of course, both material and non-material. Thus, the old adage "every language is sufficient to the needs of the speakers" takes on a specific, evolutionary meaning: the language is a device whereby regionally appropriated knowledge and understanding are transmitted to later generations (Owen, 1965: 676-677).

So doing, Owen reintroduced culture as knowledge, values, attitudes and language, in addition to technology, as part of the context in which social systems, and therefore kinship systems, are established or maintained (also see Stewart's answers to Owen in Stewart, 1965). Oddly enough, Owen did not see the languages introduced by women as a challenge to the perenniality of the patrilocal rule, or language in general as a factor affecting a kinship system. In the same vein, one could also check the retention of so called traditional kinship systems against the retention of Indigenous languages.

David Murray Schneider challenged the very terms on which kinship models were based when he presented in 1968, the results of a study on kinship practices in Anglo-American society, *American Kinship*, *A Cultural Account*, followed in 1984 by *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (based on research oversea and with several Indigenous groups). He accused anthropological kinship studies of being embedded in a biased Western worldview that favored biological links over social ties and the cultural principles that he saw as primary. While his critique gave rise to developments in women's studies and feminist theories, it was based on taking kinship narrowly as a symbolic system and was too general and abstracted from everyday life to affect well-established ideas on unilineal kin groups, especially matrilineal kin groups, the issue of which had by then faded from the main scenes of research. (See Adam Kuper, 2018, for an assessment of Schneider's ideas, and of their consequences). In spite of his emphasis on kinship as a symbolic system, Schneider did not consider kinship as the expression of a worldview, even less in relation to a specific linguistic context.

At the end of the 1980s. with the emergence of new issues, new horizons, new methodologies, and the fragmentation of the discipline into a larger and larger number of sub-disciplines, kinship studies faded from the main anthropological debate, although their main terms of reference went on as a (mostly) unchallenged foundation.

Kinship issues resurfaced with the advent of evolutionary anthropology, where genes and their transmission became a new focal point of interest in a section of biological anthropology without making much of a dent in the main anthropological theoretical body. Nevertheless, the question of patrilineal versus matrilineal kinship systems found a new niche in biology (See Mary K. Shenk, Ryan O. Begley, David A. Nolin and Andre Swiatek, 2019). Strangely, feminist studies did not engage kinship studies except to endorse the opposition between patriarchy - as real and linked to patrilineality - and matriarchy - as mythical. Matrilinealiity was explicitly dismissed as an area of non-interest.

Linguistics never developed into the core discipline it should have become, given its central position in cultural processes, and in North America, never received the funding it needed to flourish. Languages and linguistic factors continued to provide an expedient way to identify societies and their genetic connections, but few researchers managed to explore the connections between language and culture (see Rik Pinxten, 1989, for an exception).

2 - *The Linguistic Factor*

Georges Peter Murdock, who used linguistic identity in order to identify his sample societies (as did most of his colleagues), in particular for his American comparative samples, did not consider it more valuable than a test. He wrote rather forcefully:

> Linguistic stocks provide an ideal means of making a test. An irresistible conclusion from demonstrated relationships is that the ancestors of the peoples now speaking related languages must once have formed a single linguistic community, which must also have had a common culture including a common social organization. As the descendants of the speakers of the ancestral language subsequently spread into different regions, they must necessarily have undergone modifications in culture and social structure as well as language. By and large, therefore, we should expect differences in social organization among linguistically related peoples to decrease as we go backward in time, and to disappear as our time depth approaches the period of the original linguistic community. Unless our reconstructions tend to show such a convergence in the past within individual linguistic stocks, the method must be presumed faulty. (Murdock 1949:346-7)

Today, in North America, language is still treated by Murdock, his contemporaries, and his successors as a label identifying the group, not as a correlating feature in the development or survival of its kinship system orientation.

In 1922, Edward Sapir, anthropologist and linguist, had made a first foray in the idea of language as a factor in kinship development, while responding to Kroeber who could not find any way to explain why the Yurok and Wiyot kinship systems were so unlike their neighbors of Southern and Central California. Sapir then attempted to prove a genetic connection between the two Californian groups and the Algonquian family, which proved to be valid. But he did not pursue the matter further. As he explains:

> In spite of the inherent difficulties of the task, it may eventually be possible to work out some of the primary kinship features of the whole [Algic] group, to dispose of others as secondary developments. A refined and detailed study of the whole course of change, from the oldest and most fundamental features down to the most recent dialectic or regional ramifications, it is a task for an Algonquian specialist. I shall not attempt it, the more so as it inevitably leads to a far-reaching distributional study. (Sapir, 1922: 60-61)

It is only later, in the 1960s, that David Aberle attempted such a distributional study focused on the Athapaskan speaking peoples. Following rigorous lexical reconstruction methods, he and Isidore Dyen traced features and variations from the northern to the southern Athapaskan groups, so that a first synthesis was provided wherein certain types of kinship systems were associated with culture and language. However, there was no follow up on his analysis or his conclusions; even Joseph Jorgensen omitted language from the variables affecting kinship and social organization features in his landmark comparative distribution study of the traits defining Indigenous cultures in the western and northwestern Pacific Coast regions.

A supporting hypothesis would come more recently from a very different direction. A correlation newly noticed (Guédon 2016) between the linguistic identity of North American Indigenous communities and the presence or absence of matrilineal and patrilineal systems, or bilateral systems, suggests a connection between the language spoken by a group, its values and worldview, and the development of descent systems.

In the initial phase of the project leading to that hypothesis, we used classical data and long established definitions of matriliny and patriliny to chart the Indigenous nations and/or communities according to the official American classification of their linguistic identity, and the recorded presence or absence of matrilines or patrilines. Combining linguistics studies with ethnographies of North American Indigenous peoples provided further data on their kinship and social organization. This first list confirmed a close association between kinship systems and linguistic families in North America in general. It was presented and discussed at the Southwestern University of Nationalities in Chengdu, Sichuan, China, during the launch of the World Matricultures Research Institute in Chengdu (WIMCRI), an international conference that brought together scholars from all continents.

Simply, we mapped the geographic distribution of matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups in Indigenous North America following their classic definition and attribution to cultural groups, as presented by George Peter Murdock first in 'North American Social Organization' (*Davidson Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 1, no. 2, Winter 1955), then in his *Ethnographic Atlas* (and as found today in the Human Relations Areas Files). These references, which have stood the test of time and remain until now generally accepted, first demonstrated the scattered distribution of matrilineal features throughout the continent. They also confirmed the importance of such features in North American Indigenous cultures. The estimated proportion of matrilineal societies in North America varies widely from one source to the next, from about 15 % for the most conservative (including Murdock) to almost 50 % of the total number of Indigenous people in North America, depending on the date of publication, definition of society, and definition of matrilineality. But even if we take the proportion at its lowest, i.e. 15%, North America still has the highest proportion of cultures tracing descent matrilineally of any continental culture area (Knack, 2004). Patrilineality is similarly distributed throughout the continent. The default identity, that of bilaterality, is attributed to both hunter-gatherers in low demographic density environments and to highly accculturated populations, but it also serves as a residual category for ambiguous systems.

Several factors intervene to blur the picture.

a) Already hard hit with widespread death by waves of epidemics, Indigenous populations have also undergone much demographic, geographic, social, and cultural change and loss due to European colonization, including wars, slavery, forced relocation and the loss of landbases. Indigenous communities faced the challenges of reconstructing their heritage from a handful of elders. This long process lead to the erasure of many cultural processes, but also to rapid adaptation to new situations. This adaptation included kinship systems moving in one direction from matrilineal to patrilineal following the dominant European model, sometimes in the space of two or three generations and sometimes still in progress in present times.

b) Since many of the first European observers of North American Indigenous cultures (and many of the subsequent researchers who relied upon them) were coming themselves from patriarchal societies, they could not understand or recognize matrilineal systems of kinship and social organization. They noticed instead, for instance, that Indigenous peoples were not able to understand normal (i.e. European) 'common' kinship terms, although European newcomers did remark on the surprising (for them) number of Indigenous women involved in trade and politics. The documents we have from that period reflect these cultural biases.

c) We find a related methodological blindness in the ethnography of North American Indigenous cultures that, for the most part favors men, men's activities, and male organizations, so much so that it is rare to access information about women. It is assumed that men are the makers of culture, even though it is also assumed that women are the primary socializers. So, for instance, in the case of a bilineal kinship system, with matrilineal transmission of certain positions and the patrilineal transmissions of other positions, only the male system is described or mentioned. The case of the Cree traplines in Quebec is an interesting example in that, according to the Quebec government, the trap lines should be transmitted as property within the family, meaning from father to son (according to government officials' interpretation) and should be managed by men. Yet, from the Cree perspective, 'within the family' means that the trap lines may be and are transmitted within a family that includes women. For instance, parents may bequeath a trap line through a daughter to a son-in-law; a maternal or paternal uncle may give his trap lines to his nephew; a wife may pass hers to her husband or to her daughter.

d) On the methodological level, we are facing terms of reference that vary from one period to the next. Often, even recent research does not have the proper tools to identify matrilineal or patrilineal traits. We are just beginning to recognize the wide diversity of moiety, clan, and lineage systems, variations in the role of the mother's brother, of the father and of the father's kin group, or of in-laws' kin groups in the overall kinship system, along with the types of matrilines produced in response to acculturation and inter-ethnic marriages. For examples of this last, see the matrilocal systems of the Cheyenne, the Arapaho and the Ute, or the differing responses to a weakening of the exogamous marriage rules in the Pacific Northwest Indigenous communities. (In this case, Tlingit elders still attempt to enforce a strong and traditional clan exogamy by excluding from the clan those born from the wrong (endogamous) unions, while nearby Tsimshian communities favour the adoption of either the groom or bride into another appropriate lineage, so that the availability of adoption safeguards the integrity of clan exogamy while still allowing free choice of marriage partners.)

e) Finally, the thorny question of the parameters for identifying exactly what constitutes a distinct society, community, or cultural group for, in this case, the eventual purpose of statistical analysis or comparative approach, cannot be solved on a globally acceptable basis. What constitutes a distinct society varies from institution to institution, from author to author. Furthermore, in both Canada and the USA, a list of the Indigenous communities who survive outside of the official system that controls 'Indian status' must be added to the list of federally recognized 'Indian tribes' and communities, as several distinct Indigenous societies in North America are still today fighting for

federal recognition, such as the Nipmuk nation in Massachusetts, USA, or the Lubicon Cree in Alberta, Canada.

Despite these methodological problems, however, we can still develop relevant and worthwhile questions.

3 - *North American Indigenous Linguistic Families*

The official list of linguistically different Indigenous communities in Canada and the United States totals around seven hundred culturally distinct communities of all sizes, from some very large groups (tens of thousands or more) to small ones counting only a few individual members. This is an approximation because of the difficulties inherent in the identification of Amerindian societies after several centuries of upheaval following the arrival of European colonizers and settlers. As mentioned above, these upheavals include the drastic loss of population from epidemics, wars, forced removal from their land with the destruction of their economic basis of survival, and the attempt at forced assimilation through mandatory residential boarding schools, among others processes. Despite of the resulting erosion of their linguistic heritage, Indigenous communities most often still use their original language to identify themselves, and linguistic boundaries still indicate the social limits of communities. Distinct languages, even when they are extinct, also define more precisely the identity of each culture, which allows ethnographers and other non-Indigenous observers to distinguish one community from another. Both in Canada and the USA, the original language families, languages and dialects are still used by administrators alongside geographical location to identify Indigenous communities.

According to Edward Sapir, the linguist whose early classification of American Indigenous language families proposed in 1929 was used until recently as a primary reference, there were about twenty-three classes or stocks of linguistic families in North America. Each was divided into groups containing in total several hundred distinct languages. More recently, according to Goddard (1996) and to Nithun (1999), linguists today still recognize 296 languages north of Mexico, which are subdivided into 29 families not including 27 isolates (groups that are not linguistically affiliated to any other group); 29 of these languages or isolates are now extinct.

Linguistic families vary widely in the proportion of speakers, both in the past and today, and in the number of languages they contain. Some linguistic families may support only one language (Kutenai or Zuni, for example) while others support many branches, each subdivided into many distinct languages. The Algonquian linguistic family, for instance, contains dozens of languages scattered from northern Canada to eastern, central and southern United States. Others are represented by a few languages and geographically restricted to one region. One of Sapir's linguistic families, the Na-dene, is not really a linguistic family but, rather, a residual category encompassing languages and linguistic isolates that share the geographical region of northwestern North America. Yet, most of Sapir's propositions have been confirmed.

When one juxtaposes linguistic maps (whether the oldest ones beginning with Edward Sapir's distribution of language families or the more recent ones like those produced by Goddard or

Nithun) with maps showing the distribution of kinship systems in North America, some languages appear to show a strong correlation with the presence of matrilineality or matrilocality. If one classifies the many indigenous societies, big or small, according to their linguistic affiliation, matrilineal societies tend to fall into a limited series of linguistic families. Communities or tribes speaking a language belonging to the Athapaskan (or Na-dene), Iroquoian, Muskogean, Caddoan, Tsimshian, or Keresan linguistic families are extremely likely to be organized according to matrilineal principles, and they all exhibit kinship system features that are able to support matrilineality. In societies where people speak languages that are included in the Caddoan, Iroquoian, and Tsimshian language families, *all* communities or tribes are matrilineal. Among some linguistic families such as the Athapaskan, where most tribes are matrilineal, those that are not matrilineal, such as the northeastern Athapaskan or the Californian Athapaskan, still share a number of kinship system features that are associated with matrilineality, which suggests a previous matrilineal system (See David Aberle and Isidore Dyen, 1974, for an introduction to the kinship and matrilineal features of the Athapaskan speaking tribes intended for a reconstruction of the Proto-Athapaskan kinship system). The Tlingit and the Eyak who join the Athapaskans within the Na-Dene stock are also fully matrilineal. We should also note that in several cases, such as the Athapaskan and Salishan, populations defined by sharing the same language family do not reside in the same region, and may often belong to different cultural areas.

By contrast, with very few exceptions, Indigenous peoples speaking Uto-Aztecan (including the bilateral Shoshoni), Yuman-Hokan, Penutian, Eskimo-Aleutian, and Wakashan languages are almost never matrilineal. Among the few exceptions are languages whose speakers live in close proximity to strongly matrilineal societies, such as the Haisla (Wakashan), who live near the Coastal Tsimshian of Heartley Bay (British Columbia), and the Havasupai (Yuman) near the Apache (Athapaskan). This factor of social and geographical proximity inviting inter-marriages may work also in reverse, as in the case of the Algonquian-speaking Atsina, who seem to have acquired patrilineal kinship systems and clans relatively recently, perhaps due to the proximity of their Siouan neighbors. In this case, the process appears to have followed the introduction of horses and the development of the Plains as a cultural area of its own.

The Hopi people in the American Southwest, with their strong matriclans, used to be considered by all linguists as a linguistic isolate. If included among the Uto-Aztecan, as recently proposed, they would be the unique exception among the bilateral or patrilineal Uto-Aztecan language family, a very large linguistic family representing more than sixty languages spreading from the western United States to Mexico and even further south, including the Shoshone people in Idaho, as well as the Ute people and the Aztec and Huichol speakers in Mexico. The inclusion of the matrilineal Hopi among the Uto-Aztecan is still very disputed, and when included, they are considered an isolated linguistic side-branch of the family with no known close relative in the family; their strong matrilineal descent system does not invalidate the hypothesis.

Similarly, the Tsimshian family with its five languages or dialects was until recently generally considered an isolated language group. However, some linguists have recently proposed to join it with the large Penutian language family, though only as a divergent side-branch. This proposition is not unanimously accepted, but then the Penutian language family is itself a contested category

and considered to be a complex system of divergent language families by some. By others, it is thought to be more an amalgam of separate families. Again, and for the same reason, the matrilineal Tsimshian do not invalidate the hypothesis.

There remain two major exceptions to the proposed theoretical link between matrilineal societies and the kind of language they speak: the Siouan family and the Algonquian family.

The Siouan family is split rather dramatically between matrilineal or matrilocal systems, patrilineal systems, and bilateral systems. Siouan speakers scattered throughout the Great Plains following the arrival of horse in North America and subsequent European colonization, and the composition of the language family is still debated by linguists. (Edward Sapir considered the language family, then joined with the Hokan, to be 'a wastepaper basket stock'.) Its history is complex, with tribes moving westwards away from their homelands during a violent period that saw decimated bands being moved, imprisoned, or relocated by American authorities, and other bands expanding into new environments. On one hand, speakers of languages such as Mandan, Hidatsa, and Crow are matrilineal and matrilocal, as are the southeastern Catawba speakers. On the other hand, Assiniboine, Omaha, Ponca, Osage, Kansa, Iowa, Oto, and Missouri speakers have patrilineal kinship systems, while the Dakota, Lakota, and Nakota, now considered patrilineal, show indications of having once been bilateral. And what are we supposed to do with the Siouan-speaking Winnebago with their exogamous patriclans divided into two moieties (Above and Below)?

> According to Radin, (1923: 181-90, 207-12), there was an inherent instability in the clan system that antedated reservation times. [...] The occasional inheritance of war bundles in the female line was attributed to lack of qualified make heirs, and the naming and claiming of children by the mother's clan supposedly rested entirely on the mother's clan being better able to afford the cost of a naming feast. [...] What might be construed as clan exogamy seems to have been fairly rigidly observed, but so was proscription against marriage between people who were deemed close matrilineal relatives. [...] (Lurie, 1978: 694-695)

Adding the relationship between a mother's brother and his nieces and nephews, where the uncle is said to be closer to his sister's children than to his own because 'they are of the same body' (i.e. share the same female line) to shared allusions in myths and traditions, Radin concluded that the Winnebago were once matrilineal.

The relationship between Siouan language family and kinship systems needs revisiting, especially when the acquisition of patrilineal kinship systems appears recent or when matrilineal features seem combined with patrilineal features (Dakota, Lakota). Moreover, the criteria used by American ethnologists to list a group as bilateral are often too vague to be conclusive.

The case of the Algonquian linguistic family is even more complex. Algonquian is the second largest Indigenous language family on the continent, with some thirty distinct languages and not including the dialects (See Goddard, 1969, 1996, and Mithun, 1999). The Algonquian family is part of a larger

language stock - the Algic stock - presumed to have originally spread from a west-central location. The Algic stock includes two other families each represented by a single language, the Yurok and the Wiyot. When the Algic stock split, probably around 4000 years ago, Yurok and Wiyot moved south and west independently from each other and away from the third Algic family, the Algonquians; the first two families, each represented by one language, are now located on the coast of Northern California. The Yurok and Wiyot languages are still recognizable as relatives of the Algonquian languages, in particular because their kinship terminology is close to that of the other Algonquian speakers, including the northeastern groups (Sapir, 1922). According to the literature presently available, 30 to 50% of the groups whose members speak or used to speak one of the languages belonging to the Algonquian linguistic family are or were at one time identified as matrilineal or matrilocal. Of the rest, about 40% are identified as having been at one time patrilineal and the remaining groups are labeled bilateral. With one exception (bilateral Cree), all the Algonquian speakers in Canada are now officially identified as patrilineal.

Today, most linguists subdivide the Algonquian languages following their geographical locations: plains, central, northern, and eastern seaboard. According to Murdock and to the old orthodoxy, the plains people were big game hunters and, therefore, probably patrilineal unless their previous subsistence patterns, such as as mixed horticulture (for the women) and hunting and fishing (for the men), favored a bilateral development. With respect to the northern Algonquians bands in Canada, there could only be patrilineality or bilateral systems amongst them, with a bias toward patriliny as the population increased. The central Algonquians depended partly on horticulture, with hunting and fishing to complement their subsistence strategy, thereby supporting a relatively high density of population. Therefore, they also had to be patrilineal. On the other hand, on the Atlantic coast, where the eastern Algonquian sub-family stretches from the Saint Lawrence River down the coast and into adjacent territories in a long region warm enough to allow horticulture, women did most of the work and may have controlled the production of food, providing sufficient resources to sustain a much higher population density. There, anthropological orthodoxy identified a good ground for the development of matrilineal systems. Moreover, there is disagreement among the ethnographers, especially between earlier and later reports, and research done in the second half of the twentieth century tends to take Murdock's ideas as a default or starting point.

A more precise reading of the ethnographic material throws doubt on the official classifications. For instance, on the Atlantic coast, the Narraganset and their neighbors had both matrilineal exogamous clans and chieftainship inherited through the male line, although a daughter could succeed her father. The descriptions change as history proceeds. In the plains, the Cheyennes were originally described as matrilocal and matrilineal by John Mooney and Rudolphe Charles Petter (1905) and George Bird Grinnel (1923). More recently, after a series of mid-century studies arguing that the Cheyennes were either bilateral or quasi-patrilineal, John Moore (1974) produced a sophisticated analysis of the Cheyenne socio-political systems to conclude that Cheyenne bands were indeed 'matrilineal matrilocal uterine groups' lead by a council of peace chiefs selected in the 'uterine' line, while the bands' five military societies were 'agnatic units of organization' which in war and during the conflict with the US military acquired more authority. Moore's conclusions were disputed by Hoebel in 1980.

Both cases of the Siouan and the Algonquian speaking peoples concern a large population scattered over a wide surface of the North American continent, and this merits consideration. It leaves open a number of questions. In any case, if the hypothesis of a link between language and descent in North America is to stand, at least three options or hypotheses have to be considered:

> 1 - The postulated link between language and descent system is not a strong one and has been ignored for some reason with respect to Siouan and the Algonquian-speaking peoples, which begs for a review of the ethnohistorical, linguistic and ethnographical data in these two areas. This review would attempt to identify why these two language families do not follow the other linguistic families in their association with certain types of descent.
>
> 2- The official classification of groups as patrilineal, matrilineal or bilateral is somehow faulty, and must be reviewed on the basis of a more precise and critical reading of the ethnographical material, which would take into account the historical changes that took place in the communities in question, the more so as many areas suffer from an endemic scarcity of information and a general absence of information about women's perspectives and organizations.
>
> 3- The terms of reference to describe descent systems as matrilineal, patrilineal or bilateral are inadequate for the task.

These three hypotheses are going to be explored in the next phase of the project (part 2 of this report, forthcoming), using the Algonquian linguistic family and their kinship systems as a test case. The basic framework was elaborated in preparation for, and then expanded during, a 2017 workshop hosted by the InterCulture research group at the University of Ottawa, Canada, in collaboration with representatives of eastern Canadian Indigenous communities (*see workshop report written by Linnéa Rowlatt, this issue*). Entitled *From Matrilineal Kinship to Matriculture: Establishing a Canadian Agenda*, this workshop also allowed us to test some revised definitions and brought us in touch with the very practical consequences of our research.

If a linguistic correlation is confirmed between descent systems and language, the features of these societies' worldviews that are integrated in or carried by language, such as their cosmology, ethos, and basic epistemological or philosophical principles, may play a role in maintaining said systems. The link between worldview and language as first advocated by Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, much discussed when it was first proposed, has become more acceptable today, and studies like Rik Pinxten's on the Navaho semantics of space have confirmed that language carries root principles that feed the entire cultural complex (Pinxten, 1983). Swanson's ideas on the influence of value systems on political organization and the development of descent may also be tested at the same time for a linguistic correlation. Even if one does not accept Sapir's perspective, the correlation between descent type and language remains a pending question for the North American continent.

Conclusion of Part 1

Prologue (*original version*)
In 1977, Sandra Lovelace, a Maliseet (Malecite) woman on the Tobique reserve in Canada, brought a case of discrimination to the United Nations Human Rights Committee in what is known as the case of Lovelace v. Canada. This case was about the fact that Canadian Indigenous women lost their official Indian Status when they married a white man (while Indian men could marry White women without loosing their status). The U.N. ruled in her favor, and, after years of advocacy, the Canadian Indian Act was modified. During the proceedings, the representative of the Canadian Federal government argued that in order to protect the land rights of the Indigenous communities, only native men should inherit these rights because, as he declared: “Indian people in Canada are patrilineal”.

This statement directly contradicted official documents describing matrilineal systems among the Iroquois peoples, as well as the Tsimshian, Haida, and Tlingit peoples, on the Canadian Northwest Coast, and half the Athapaskan speaking people in the Northwest, and confirmed the official status of the Algonquian speakers who occupy the greater part of the Canadian territory between the Atlantic Coast and the Rocky Mountains, from the Blackfoot in the western Plains to the Cree in Ontario and Quebec, to the Mi’kmak and Maliseet on the Atlantic Coast, among others. To define indigenous communities as patrilineal inflects the legal and administrative codes governing their life, the rights of grandparents to raise their grandchildren for instance, or the transmission of trap lines and territorial rights, or the political rights to speak for one’s community. In view of the matrilineal history of many of the Algonquian speaking community in the USA, are the Canadian Algonquians really patrilineal? How did their descent system acquire such an aura of validity? And given the use of linguistic affiliation rather than the geographical area or type of economy, to identify the matrilineal and patrilineal societies, is language more than a convenient way to identify Indigenous communities?

References (for all phases of the project)

Aberle, David (1961), 'Matrilineal descent in cross-cultural perspective', Ch. 17 in David Schneider and Kathleen Gough, eds., *Matrilineal Kinship*, Oakland: University of California Press.

Boyer, Yvonne (2009), 'First Nations Women's Contributions to Culture and Community through Canadian Law', in *Restoring the Balance. First Nations Women, Community and Culture*, edited by Gail Guthrie Valaskakis, Madeline Dion, and Eric Guimond, Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2009, 69-96.

Brody, Hugh (1981), *Maps and Dreams: A Journey into the Lives and Lands of the Beaver Indians of Northwest Canada*, Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.

Bruhns, Karen Olsen, and Karen E. Stothert (1999) *Women in Ancient America*, second edition, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Brumbach, Etty Jo, and Robert Jarvenpa (2006), 'Woman the Hunter: Ethnoarchaeological Lessons from Chipewyan Life-Cycle Dynamics', in *The Days of our Grandmothers. A Reader in Aboriginal Women's History in Canada*, edited by Mary-Ellen Kelm and Lorna Townsend, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Callender, Charles (1978), "Great Lakes- Riverine Socio-political Organization" in *Handbook of North American Indian*, vol 15, William C. Sturtevant ed, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 610-21.

Campbell, Lyle (1997), *American Indian languages: The historical linguistics of Native America* New York: Oxford University Press.

Canfield, Amy E. (2010), 'The "Civilizing Mission" Revisited: The Impacts of Assimilation on Shoshone-Bannock Women', *Idaho Yesterdays*, 51:1 (Spring/Summer).

Dorsey, George Amos, and Alfred Louis Koeber (1903), *Traditions of the Arapaho*, Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.

Driver, Harold, E. (1969), *Indians of North America*, 2nd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dyen, Isidore and David Aberle (1974), *Lexical Reconstruction: The Case of the Proto-Athapaskan Kinship System*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ember, Melvin, and Carol R. Ember (1971) 'The Conditions Favoring Matrilocal versus Patrilocal Residence,' *American Anthropologist*, 73, 571-94.

Ember, Melvin, Carol R. Ember, and Burton Pasternack (1974), 'On the Development of Unilinear Descent', *American Anthropologist*, 30, 69-94.

Flannery, Regina (1935), 'The Position of Woman among the Eastern Cree', *Primitive Man*, 8:4, 81-6.
- (1953) *The Gros Ventres of Montana: Part I, Social Life*, The Catholic University of America Anthropological Series 15, Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Gifford, Edward W. (1940), 'A Problem in Kinship Terminology', *American Anthropologist* New Series 42, 190–94.

Frink, Lisa, Rita Shepard and Gregory Reinhardt (2002), *Many Faces of Gender: Roles & Relationships Through Time in Indigenous Northern Communities*, Louisville: University Press of Colorado; illustrated edition.

Goddard, Ives (1999), *Native languages and language families of North America*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press (Smithsonian Institution).
- (1996) 'Introduction', *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 17. Languages*, Ives Goddard, ed., Washington: The Smithsonian Institution, 1-16.
- (1994) 'The West-to-East Cline in Algonquian Dialectology', William Cowan, ed., *Papers of the 25th Algonquian Conference*, Ottawa: Carleton University, 187–211.
- (1980) 'Eastern Algonquian as a genetic subgroup', William Cowan, ed., *Papers of the eleventh Algonquian Conference*, Ottawa: Carleton University, 143-58.
- (1979a) 'Comparative Algonquian', *The Languages of Native America*, Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, eds, Austin: University of Texas Press, 70-132.
- (1979b) 'The evidence for Eastern Algonquian as a genetic subgroup', *Algonquian Linguistics* 5:2, 19-22.

Grinnell, George Bird (1923), *The Cheyenne Indians: their history and way of life*, 2 vols., New Haven: Yale University Press.

Guédon, Marie-Françoise (2016a), 'Communautés autochtones et crise ontologique' Note de lecture, *Revue Ethnologie* française, PUF, 2017, regarding Nastassja Martin *Les Âmes sauvages. Face à l'Occident, la résistance d'un peuple d'Alaska*, Paris, La Découverte.
- (2016b) 'L'ours grizzly et les Atnas de la rivière du Cuivre (Alaska)' dans *Sous la peau de l'ours. L'humanité et les ursidés : approche interdisciplinaire*, sous la direction de Pierre Leroux, Institut d'ethnologie, Laboratoire Sage – UMR CNRS 7363, Paris : Connaissance et Savoirs (CS).
- (May 2013), 'Matrilinear Societies or Matrilinear Cultures', annual meeting of the Canadian Anthropolical Society/ée Canadianne d'Anthropologie, May 2013, Victoria, BC.

Héritier, Françoise (1996) *Masculin/Féminin. La pensée de la difference*, Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob.

Hoebel, E. Adamson (1980), 'On Cheyenne Sociopolitical Organization', *Plains Anthropologist* Volume 25, 161-69

Jenness, Diamond (1963), *The Indians of Canada*, originally published in 1932, Ottawa, National Museum of Canada *Bulletin 65* Anthropological Series 15.

Jorgensen, Joseph (1980), *Western Indians: Comparative Environments, Languages and Cultures of 172 Western American Indian Tribes*, New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Kid, Kenneth, E. (1937), *Blackfoot Ethnography. Being a Synthesis of the Data of Ethnological Science with the Information Concerning the Blackfoot Indians contained in the Writings of the Explorers, Travellers and Traders from the time of First Contact to the Year 1821*, Archaeological surveys of Alberta, manuscript Series no 8, 1986, (a thesis presented at the University of Toronto, 1937).

Klein, Laura F. and Lillian A. Ackerman, eds. (1995), *Women and Power in Native North Americ*a,, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Knack, Martha C. (2004), 'Women and Men', in *A Companion to the Anthropology of American Indians*, ed. Thomas Biolsi, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Kuper, Adam (2018), 'We need to talk about kinship', *Anthropology of This Century* 23 (October) , available online: http://aotcpress.com/articles/talk-kinship/; paper presented at European Association of Social Anthropologists annual conference, Stockholm, August 2018.

Landes, Ruth (1938), *Ojibwa Women*, Columbia University Press.

Leacock, Eleanor (1987), 'Gender in Egalitarian Societies', in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, 2nd edition, eds., Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- (June 1978) 'Women's Status in Egalitarian Society: Implications for Social Evolution', in *Current Anthropology*, 19:2 (submitted in final form September 10, 1977, and based on paper originally given at annual meeting, American Anthropological Association Nov. 1974); supp. *Inquiry and Debate in the Human Sciences: Contributions from Current Anthropology*, 1960–1990 (Feb 1992), ISSN 0011-3204 and E-ISSN 1537-5382, 225 ff.
- editor with Nancy Lurie (1971), *North American Indians in Historical Perspective*, New York: Random House.
- (1954) 'The Montagnais 'Hunting Territory' and the Fur Trade', *American Anthropologist*, 56:5 (part 2); American Anthropological Association Memoirs 78.

Lounsbury, Floyd G. (1978), 'Iroquoian Languages', *Handbook of American Indians: Northeast* 15, ed., Bruce Trigger, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 334-5.

Lowie, Robert (1982), *Indians of the Plains*, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Lurie, Nancy Oestricht (1978), 'Winnebago', *Handbook of North American Indians* 15, ed., Bruce Trigger, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 690-707.

Mathieu, Christine (2003), *A History and Anthropological Study of the Ancient Kingdoms of the Sino-Tibetan Borderland – Naxi and Mosuo*, Mellen Studies in Anthropology 11, New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Mathieu, Nicole-Claude, ed. (2007), *Une maison sans fille est une maison morte. La personne et le genre en sociétés matrilinéaires et/ou uxorilocales*, Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Mithun, Marianne (1999), *The languages of Native North America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moondancer and Strong Woman (2007), *A Cultural History of the Native Peoples of Southern New England: Voices from Past and Present*, Boulder: Bauu Press.

Mooney, James, and Rodolph Charles Petter (1905), *The Cheyenne Indians*, Lancaster: published for Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association Memoir, 1:6.

Moore, John H. (1987), *The* Cheyenne *Nation: A Social and Demographic History*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Murdock, George Peter (1967), *Ethnographic Atlas: A Summary*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

-- (1955), 'North American Social organization'. *Davidson Journal of Anthropology*, 1:2, 85-97.

– (1949), *Social Structure*, New York: MacMillan Co.

Pinxten, Rik, Ingrid Van Dooren and Frank Harvey (1983), *Anthropology of Space: explorations into the natural philosophy and semantics of the Navajo*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Powell, John Wesley (1915), *Linguistic families of American Indians north of Mexico* (revised by members of the staff of the Bureau of American Ethnology), Map, Bureau of American Ethnology miscellaneous publication 11, Baltimore: Hoen.

– (1891), '*Indian Linguistic Families Of America, North Of Mexico'*, Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1885-1886, Washington: Government Printing Office.

Proulx, Paul (1984), 'Two models of Algonquian linguistic prehistory', *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 50, 165-207.

Rice, Keren (1998), '*Les langues Athapascanes du Nord, Une introduction'*, Recherches amérindiennes au Québec, vol. XXVIII, 3, 75-92.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves (2002) *Women at the Center: Life in a modern Matriarchy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves, and R. Callagher, eds. (1990), *Beyond the Second Sex. New Directions in the Anthropology of Gender*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sapir. Edward (1922), 'The Algonkin affinity of Yurok and Wiyot kinship terms', *Journal de la société des américanistes*, 14-15, 36-74.

Schlegel, Alice (1972), *Male dominance and female autonomy: domestic authority in matrilineal societies*, New Haven: HRAF Press.

Schneider, David Murray (1980), *American Kinship, A Cultural Account*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

-- (1984), *A critique of the Study of Kinship*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Schneider, David Murray, and George C. Homans (1955), 'Kinship Terminology and the American Kinship System', *American Anthropologist* New Series (The USA as Anthropologists See It), 57:6, 1194-1208.

Schneider, David Murray, and Kathleen Gough (1974), *Matrilineal Kinship*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shenk, Mary K., Ryan O. Begley, David A. Nolin, and Andre Swiatek (2019), 'When does matriliny fail? The frequencies and causes of transitions to and from matriliny estimated from a *de novo* coding of a cross-cultural sample', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B (Biology)*, special themed issue 'The evolution of female-biased kinship in humans and other mammals', eds., Siobhán M. Mattison, Mary K. Shenk, Melissa Emery Thompson, Monique Borgerhoff Mulder and Laura Fortunato, 374 (1780), The Royal Society Publishing, available online: https://hraf.yale.edu/ehc/documents/1253, accessed 1 March 2020, doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0006.

Snow, Dean, R. (1978), 'Late Prehistory of the East Coast', *Handbook of North American Indian*, 15, ed., Bruce Trigger, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 58-69.

Speck, Frank (1918), 'Kinship terms and the Family Band among the Northeastern Algonkian' *American Anthropologist*, ns., 20:2, 143-61.

Stewart, Julian H. (1938), *Basin-Plateau aboriginal socio-political groups*. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 120. Washington, D. C. 1939

-- (1939) 'Some observations on Shoshonean distributions.' *American Anthropologist* 41 : 261-65.

-- (1955), *Theory of culture change: the methodology of multilinear evolution*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Swanson, Guy, E. (1969), ‘Rules of descent, studies in the sociology of parentage’, *Anthropological Papers* 39, Museum of Anthropology, Ann Arbour: University of Michigan.

Thornton, Russel (2004), ‘Historical Demography’, *A Companion to the Anthropology of American Indian*, ed., Thomas Biolsi, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Trigger, Bruce (1978), ‘Cultural Unity and Diversity’, *Handbook of North American Indian* 15, ed., Bruce Trigger, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 798-804.

Tuck, James, A. (1978), ‘RegionalCultural Development, 3000 to 300 BC’, *Handbook of North American Indian* 15, ed., Bruce Trigger, Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 28-43.

Waldman, Carl, and Molly Braun (1985), *Atlas of the North American Indian*, New York: Facts on File, Inc.

Weiner, Annette (1976), *Women of Value, Men of Renown: New Perspectives in Trobriand Exchange*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Wright, J. V. (1996), History of the Native People of Canada: Volume II (1,000 BC – AD 500), Hull: Canadian Museum of History.